

New Series

Volume X, Number 39

August 1959

The Review of English Studies

UNIVERSITY
OF MICHIGAN

NOV 10 1959

*A Quarterly Journal of
English Literature and the English Language*

PERIODICAL
READING ROOM

Editors: PETER ALEXANDER, NORMAN DAVIS

Assistant Editor: JEAN ROBERTSON

CONTENTS

- Wyatt and the Petrarchan Commentators. By Patricia Thomson 225
- The Audience of the Elizabethan Private Theatres. By William
A. Armstrong 234
- The Origin of *A Relation of the Imprisonment of Mr. John Bunyan*.
By Roger Sharrock 250
- Dr. Burney's Memoirs. By Miriam Benkovitz 257
- Shelley and Lucretius. By Paul Turner 269

NOTES

- Shakespeare among the Commonplaces (Kenneth Muir) 283
- Simon Forman's 'Bocke of Plaies' (J. H. P. Pafford) 289

CORRESPONDENCE

- Verse and its Feet (Ernest Schanzer) 292

(Continued at foot of next page)

OXFORD · AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

Single number: 14/- net: Subscription for four consecutive numbers: 45/-

The Review of English Studies

Advisory Panel: H. S. BENNETT; JOHN BUTT; R. W. CHAPMAN; H. B. CHARLTON; SIR IFOR EVANS; SIR HERBERT GRIERSON; EDITH J. MORLEY; ALLARDYCE NICOLL; PERCY SIMPSON; KENNETH SISAM; D. NICHOL SMITH; JAMES R. SUTHERLAND; ALICE WALKER; DOROTHY WHITELOCK; F. P. WILSON; J. DOVER WILSON; C. L. WRENN.

MSS. offered for publication, correspondence on the subject-matter of the Journal, and books for review should be addressed to The Editors, *The Review of English Studies*, c/o The Clarendon Press, Oxford. MSS. cannot be returned unless postage is enclosed. Authors of articles printed will be entitled to 25 free offprints and may buy additional copies if application is made to the Editor when returning corrected proofs.

All other correspondence should be addressed to the Publishers, Oxford University Press, Amen House, Warwick Square, London, E.C. 4.

CONTENTS (continued)

REVIEWS, ETC.

The Homilies of Wulfstan, by Dorothy Bethurum, 294; The Saga of Gunnlaug Serpent-Tongue, edited by P. G. Foote, translated by R. Quirk, 297; The Chastising of God's Children and The Treatise of Perfection of the Sons of God, edited by Joyce Bazire and Eric Colledge, 298; The Praise of Wisdom. A Commentary on the Religious and Moral Problems and Backgrounds of St. Thomas More's *Utopia*, by Edward L. Surtz, S.J., 301; The Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare, edited by Geoffrey Bullough. Vol. I, Early Comedies, Poems, *Romeo and Juliet*, 303; Kommentar zu Shakespeares Richard III. Interpretation eines Dramas, by Wolfgang Clemen, 304; Jonson and the Comic Truth, by John J. Enck; Shakespeare and Jonson, by S. Musgrove, 306; The Metaphysical Poets, selected and edited by Helen Gardner, 308; Images and Themes in Five Poems by Milton, by Rosemond Tuve, 309; Politics and the Poet. A Study of Wordsworth, by F. M. Todd, 311; The Correspondence of Arthur Hugh Clough, edited by Frederick L. Mulhauser, 313; A Critical Guide to *Leaves of Grass*, by James E. Miller, Jr., 316; Anatomy of Criticism. Four Essays, by Northrop Frye, 317; Eras and Modes in English Poetry, by Josephine Miles, 323; Papers in Linguistics, 1934-1951, by J. R. Firth, 325; Short Notices, 328; Summary of Periodical Literature, 333.

WYATT AND THE PETRARCHAN COMMENTATORS

By PATRICIA THOMSON

I

THE most interesting aspects of Wyatt's translation and imitation of Petrarch's poems have always proved to be his divergences from the source. Miss Foxwell long ago remarked on his habit of omitting Petrarch's descriptions of the beauty of nature or mistress in order to investigate more fully 'states of mind'.¹ And since his own state of mind is Wyatt's chief concern he has frequently been found more egotistical than Petrarch.² Chambers also noted the absence of the 'circumambient penumbra of spirituality' in which Laura is veiled,³ and Mr. Lever gives a striking instance of Wyatt's 'cynical and rebellious' handling of Petrarch.⁴

All this receives strong confirmation from a comparison of the texts of Petrarch and Wyatt. Where Wyatt's versions are measured against the accepted modern interpretation of the sonnets to Laura the result will usually be valid. But the variety of editorial opinion in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries must also be considered. There is the possibility, in fact, that Wyatt's evident freedom in interpretation owes something to the editions and commentaries he consulted, while a general allowance should certainly be made for his awareness that Petrarch's sonnets could be approached and interpreted in more than one way. There is also a strong prior supposition that Wyatt did consult the Petrarchan commentaries: a large number of fifteenth- and sixteenth-century editions contain these alongside the text, so that the eye, even of a casual reader, cannot escape them.⁵ Consequently, editions and commentaries up to and including Wyatt's own 'Italian' period have a possible relevance to his interpretations: he visited Italy in 1527, his translations of Petrarch are usually assigned to

¹ *The Poems of Sir Thomas Wyatt*, ed. A. K. Foxwell (London, 1913), ii. 48.

² e.g. by Sergio Baldi, *La Poesia di Sir Thomas Wyatt* (Florence, 1953), p. 183.

³ E. K. Chambers, *Sir Thomas Wyatt and Some Collected Studies* (London, 1933), p. 129.

⁴ J. W. Lever, *The Elizabethan Love Sonnet* (London, 1956), p. 25.

⁵ An important exception is the Aldine edition of *Le Cose volgari di Messer Francesco Petrarca* (Venice, 1501), based on the text provided by Pietro Bembo. Filippo di Giunta's *Il Petrarca* (Florence, 1522) is also unannotated. For a complete list of fifteenth-century editions of Petrarch's poems see E. H. Wilkins, 'The Quattrocento Editions of the *Canzoniere* and the *Triumphs*', in *The Making of the 'Canzoniere' and other Petrarchan Studies* (Rome, 1951), pp. 379-401.

the years 1528-32, and for the whole period 1527-41 he was under Italian influence.

Petrarch's vernacular poems were first published in 1470, and in 1471 came the first of the annotated editions, Antonio da Tempo's. From then on there was a constant flow of new editions and commentaries, most of which were reprinted and added to again and again. Besides da Tempo, the chief of the fifteenth-century commentators were Francesco Filelfo and Girolamo Squarciafico. Filelfo's incomplete commentary was first published in 1476, and in successive editions (from about 1483) Squarciafico's additions were published with it. The notes of all three of these early interpreters of Petrarch are found together in *Li Sonetti Canzone Triumphi del Petrarcha con li soi commenti* published by Bernardino Stagnino in Venice in 1519.¹ This convenient volume illustrates some general features of the first phase in Petrarchan interpretation: for instance, it tends to perpetuate legends of Petrarch and Laura which have no foundation in fact or in the text, and also to abstract a philosophy or 'message' for all lovers even from Petrarch's most personal utterances.

A new phase was inaugurated in 1525 by Alessandro Vellutello, and, to a lesser extent, by Pietro Bembo. *Le Volgari Opere del Petrarcha con la esposizione di Alessandro Vellutello* incorporated the most thorough research so far made into the lives of Petrarch and Laura as well as the most scientific investigation of the text. Vellutello paid two visits to the scene of Petrarch's love for Laura, the district of Vaucluse in the Rhône valley, of which his edition includes a map.² He satisfied himself that Laura was an unmarried woman, but was able, on historical grounds, to refute Antonio da Tempo's myth that the Pope had wished Petrarch to marry her. On such evidence as he could find Vellutello himself now reconstructed what has been called 'il vero romanzo di Messer Francesco e di Madonna Laura';³ and, in handling the text, he tried to draw out the progressive story inherent in it and to give a sense of earthly happenings. He completely rearranged the order of the sonnets, remarking that while each exists for itself, yet some are obviously also connected. Vellutello resembles some interpreters of Shakespeare's sonnets in that he established the *Rime* as a biographical and highly personal document. His comments have no abstract tendencies but always refer particularly to the contents of the sonnet before him. For

¹ The individual commentators are carefully distinguished, and the notes are verbatim repetitions from the earlier editions. Stagnino, in fact, made a synthesis. His *Petrarcha con soi commenti sopra li Sonetti e Canzone* (Venice, 1522) includes virtually the same material.

² On the popularity of this map and its possible influence on Mlle de Scudéry see E. H. Wilkins's chapter 'Vellutello's Map of Vaucluse and the *Carte de Tendre*', *Petrarchan Studies*, pp. 407-13.

³ L. Baldacci, *Il Petrarchismo italiano nel Cinquecento* (Milan-Naples, 1957), p. 52.

instance, to introduce 'Mie venture al venir son tarde e pigre' (lviii), he says simply that Petrarch is here lamenting his own unhappy fate: 'Duolsi il Poe. nel presente So. della sua trista sorte.'¹ Filelfo, by contrast, had emphasized its general purport as a demonstration of a quality common to all lovers, who always experience unpleasant and contrary emotions: 'dimostra la qualita de gli innamorati: che sempre si trouano in passione repugnante e contrarie.'²

Concerned as he was with Petrarch's sentiments, Vellutello's references to style and technique are as brief as his predecessors'. His 'Proemio' does, however, draw attention to the fact that Pietro Bembo's study of 'l'arte, figure, et rettorici colori' had just been given to the press. The *Prose di M. Pietro Bembo nelle quali si ragiona della volgar lingua* was published in Venice in September 1525, only one month after Vellutello's edition. The two complement each other. This early piece of 'aesthetic' criticism—Bembo examines such matters as Petrarch's use of musical vowels and consonants—is also important in the history of Petrarchan interpretation. From this point the sonnets to Laura could be read as a philosophical treatise or a biography, as a manual of love or of style.

Wyatt entered the arena at this particularly lively moment in the history of Petrarchan interpretation. When he visited Italy the 1519 edition (with the commentaries of da Tempo, Filelfo, and Squarciafico) was only eight years old and Vellutello's only two. In 1527 the tide was still turning. *Il Petrarca colla spositione di Misser Giovanni Andrea Gesualdo*, first published in 1533, continued Vellutello's work to a large extent; and Gesualdo himself is an interesting critic in that his fondness for refuting or confirming earlier interpretations keeps their variety before the reader's eye. Meanwhile Vellutello's commentary, of which there were twenty-seven editions between 1525 and 1584, established itself as the most popular and influential of the sixteenth century. But it was not until 1558, after his death, that Bembo's comments were abstracted from the *Prose* and embodied in an edition of Petrarch's poems. The effect of all this on Wyatt's general attitude to Petrarch is open to surmise. He had probably heard of Bembo, but need not have read the *Prose*.³ Of the editors, he had more in common with the modern Vellutello than the old-fashioned Filelfo. For instance, his 'Ever myn happe is slacke and slo in commyng' (xxx)⁴ is

¹ F. 65^r. Vellutello's edition was published in Venice. The text and numbering of Petrarch's sonnets are taken from *Le Rime*, ed. Carducci and Ferrari, republished in Florence in 1957.

² 1519 edn., ff. 49^v–50^r.

³ I can find no evidence that Wyatt knew this or much of Bembo's work, though his 'At last withdrawe youre cruelltie' (civ) is a paraphrase of a poem from *Gli Asolani*.

⁴ Text and numbering of Wyatt's poems are taken from Kenneth Muir's edition (London, 1949).

a fairly accurate translation of the sonnet mentioned above, 'Mie venture al venir son tarde e pigre'; and it is obvious that the strongly personal emphasis of this and other of Wyatt's renderings of Petrarch reflects more of Vellutello's subjective approach than of Filelfo's generalized one. But some more detailed examples are needed to show the kind of debt Wyatt owed to the commentators, and so to judge the likelihood of influence from this quarter.

II

If for no other purpose, Wyatt simply gleaned information and cleared up obscurities by glancing at the commentaries beside the text of Petrarch's poems. For instance, the reference to Scipio Africanus in stanza xiii of 'Myne olde dere En'mye' (viii) derives from a note on stanza vii of the original, Petrarch's canzone 'Quell' antiquo mio dolce empio signore' (ccclx). The text gives a list of great men who met disaster through the treachery of women, Agamemnon, Achilles, Hannibal, and 'another':

E di tutti il più chiaro

Un altro e di virtute e di fortuna. (ll. 93-94)

In the 1519 edition 'l'altro' is explained as probably Scipio but possibly Alexander the Great (f. 150^v); while Vellutello, without any hesitation, states that he is 'lo primo Scipione Aphricano' (f. 160^v). Hence Wyatt's 'the Affricane Scipion' (l. 88).

A much greater difficulty was presented by the text of 'Perch' io t'abbia guardato di menzogna' (xlix), the original of 'Because I have the still kept fro lyes and blame' (xxv). Petrarch explains how, whereas his tears flow at night and in solitude, they disappear when he is 'before his peace': 'Poi fuggite di nanzi a la mia pace' (l. 11). Filelfo explains the inference of this somewhat obscure statement by indicating that Petrarch cannot utter the necessary sighs in the presence of one to whom he would like to reveal the griefs of his heart: 'non hauer potuto anche gittare sospiri grandi & focosi come sarebbero stati necessari in presentia di lei a cui haurebbe voluto . . . aprire li soi cordiali affanni' (f. 43^r). Vellutello's simpler note states that Petrarch's tears disappear when he is in Laura's presence, that is, just at the very moment when they might effectively help to move her to compassion: 'quando egli è alla presentia di lei, & che per muouerla a compassione di lui vorrebbe lagrimare, non ne può hauer una' (f. 65^v). Hence Wyatt's 'Then are ye gone when I should make my mone', a line owing more to the commentaries than to the text.¹ On the face of it, to substitute 'when I

¹ Emma Chini says that the line is rather a paraphrase of Vellutello than a translation of Petrarch: see 'Il Sorgere del Petrarchismo in Inghilterra e la Poesia di Sir Thomas Wyatt', *Civiltà Moderna*, vi (1934), 16. I think that the line could have been developed from the hints given by either Filelfo or Vellutello, so that this instance offers no positive proof that Wyatt used (and perhaps possessed) a copy of Vellutello's edition.

should make my mone' for 'di nanzi a la mia pace' appears unduly 'free', and it certainly has the effect of emphasizing Wyatt's personal grievance. If, then, this is an instance of Wyatt's reputed rebelliousness and egotism, it is one which is sanctioned by the Petrarchan commentators. And what led him into it in this case was, I think, simply the difficulty of understanding Petrarch's poetry.

'Suche vayn thought as wonted to myslede me' (lvi), a translation of 'Pien d'un vago penser, che mi desvia' (clxix), seems to illustrate Wyatt's habit of twisting Petrarch's meaning to suit his own more urgent and worldly interest in the business of wooing. Petrarch's soul, overcome by the sweet agony of following the evasive Laura, trembles to be gone: 'l'alma trema per levarsi a volo' (l. 6). But later, on discerning a ray of pity, he is cheered and recalls his soul: 'Allor raccolgo l'alma' (l. 12). These are now generally taken to refer to Petrarch's wish for death (the flight of the soul from the body) and to a last-minute revival of the wish to live. Wyatt, however, takes l. 6 to imply a renewal of the chase of courtship in which the heart, not the soul, is involved: 'And after her myn hert would fain be gone.' And likewise l. 12 becomes a direct description of his state of feeling and progress in wooing: 'And therewithall bolded.' Yet Wyatt is not so unorthodox as he appears, for the early commentators do not mention the desire for death. Da Tempo and Squarciafico give very brief summaries of the whole sonnet, describing Petrarch's wish to declare his feelings to Laura and how he eventually sees pity in her eyes (f. 98^v). Vellutello gives a much longer note with detailed paraphrases of the difficult lines; and this has a close bearing on Wyatt's rendering (f. 91^r). Vellutello stresses throughout Petrarch's pursuit of Laura ('cercando pur M.L.') and the need for her to retreat ('dourebbe fuggire'). For him l. 6 means that Petrarch's soul is trembling, because, seeing such sweetness in Laura, it dare do no more: 'trema & non ardisce per la rigidita, dalla qual uede tal dolcezza in lei essere accompagnata'. And when Laura shows pity, Petrarch recalls his soul, that is, he regains his confidence: 'Allhor raccolgo l'alma, cio è allhora ripiglio l'ardire.' 'Ripiglio l'ardire' fully sanctions Wyatt's 'therewithall bolded', for *ardire* means 'to dare', and *ardimento* 'boldness'. 'And after her myn hert would fain be gone' remains somewhat free, nor has Wyatt's omission of all Petrarch's references to the soul a source in Vellutello. Working upon Vellutello's hints, Wyatt makes this a sonnet solely about the adventures of the heart. He is an amorous poet who has no wish to carry his sorrows into the grave: the modern interpretation of Sonnet clxix would hardly have appealed to him. He may not have heard of other interpretations of it, though l. 6 became a controversial matter. Gesualdo (1533) thought that Petrarch was alluding to the belief that in the act of sighing the soul breaks free of the body, in support of which he cited

Diogenes.¹ The view that Laura's disdain caused Petrarch to desire death ('è cagione, ch'egli morir desidera') is found in Daniello's edition.² But these interpretations were not only uncongenial, they were probably also too late to cause any echo in Wyatt's version. Vellutello's is the main influence here.

III

Wyatt's imitations of Petrarch's sonnets, as distinct from the earlier translations, are at the outset less dependent on either text or commentary. For 'imitation', here, means a free rendering or adaptation, a virtually new poem being composed on the basis of some hint, image, or idea in the original. Wyatt's imitations certainly reveal more fully than his translations an unPetrarchan worldliness and egotism. The commentaries would therefore seem irrelevant to such rebellious 'versions' of Petrarch as 'Who so list to hount, I knowe where is an hynde' (vii). Yet even here there is the possibility that Wyatt took hints from the commentaries just as he did from the text.

'Una candida cerva sopra l'erba' (cxc) describes Petrarch's symbolic vision of a white hind, which appeared before him one spring morning and which he gazed at avidly until it tragically disappeared from the beautiful landscape just before noon. The inscriptions on the hind's collar bear witness to its inaccessibility: 'Nessun mi tocchi' and 'Libera farmi al mio Cesare parve' ('Touch me not' and 'It has pleased my lord to set me free'). The sonnet is open to a wide variety of interpretations, but all commentators naturally agree that, the white hind being Laura, it reflects a phase in Petrarch's protracted love for her. The atmosphere is dreamlike, the imagery picturesque, and the sentiment pathetic.

Wyatt converts Petrarch's contemplation of the hind into a prolonged account of hunting. Far from doting on his 'diere' he has sickened of the 'vayne travaill'; and soon he advises others to abandon the pursuit of what is obviously a wayward court lady:

Who list her hount, I put him owte of dowbte,
As well as I may spend his tyme in vain. (ll. 9-10)
Noli me tangere, for Cesars I ame;
And wylde for to hold, though I seme tame. (ll. 13-14)

The atmosphere is far from dreamlike, the picturesque description of the countryside has gone, and the sentiment is arrogant and cynical. To describe the pursuit of an inaccessible lady as so much time spent 'in vain'

¹ *Il Petrarca* (edn. 1541), f. 220.^v (The British Museum has no copy of the first edition.)

² *Sonetti, Canzoni, e Triumph di Messer Francesco Petrarca con la spositione di Bernardino Daniello da Lucca* (Venice, 1541), f. 113^r.

is to aim a blow at the foundation of the sentiment of 'courtly' love common to Petrarch and the Petrarchans. Wyatt takes only the idea for his hunting image and a few details from Petrarch's text. But he may have looked at the commentaries or heard of some of the numerous different interpretations of this sonnet.

All the commentators give virtually the same note on the inscriptions on the hind's collar: 'Nessun me tocchi' and 'Libera farmi al mio Cesare parve.' 'Noli me tangere quia Caesaris sum', they say, was a well-known Latin motto: it had been inscribed on the collars of Caesar's hinds, which were then set free but which no man ever presumed to touch or harm.¹ Wyatt's '*Noli me tangere*, for Cesars I ame' is translated not from Petrarch's text but from the motto in the margin of one of the editions. There is consequently no need to refer Wyatt's phrasing to the influence of Romanello's '*Una cerva gentil*', a sonnet itself based on Petrarch's:

Tocar non lice la mia carne intera
CAESARIS. Enim sum . . . (ll. 12-13)²

for both Wyatt and Romanello were drawing on the same source: the well-known story told by the commentators. This story could also have suggested to Wyatt the notion of 'Caesar's' exclusive ownership which is by no means conveyed in Petrarch's 'it has pleased Caesar to set me free'.

Wyatt's hunting scene, with its lively impression of a crowd of eager rivals, is remote from the spirit of Petrarch. For, though Petrarch's whole story could be said to recount his pursuit of Laura, Sonnet cxc has none of the heat of an active pursuit, and his contemplation of Laura also appears quite solitary. Squarciafico, however, hinted that others might be involved when he made the strange suggestion that the two rivers of the landscape represented the beauty of Laura which was desired by so many: '*la sua bellezza che da molto era desiderata*' (f. 103^r). Gesualdo, abandoning the contemplative element, described Petrarch's scene in terms not unlike Wyatt's. The poet is in pursuit of Laura and describes the 'amorous chase' by taking a metaphor from huntsmen: '*il Poeta descriue l'amorosa caccia prendendo la metaphora da cacciatori*' (f. 236^{r-v}). Therefore, whether Wyatt had read Gesualdo's commentary or not, Petrarch's metaphor of the elusive hind impressed him in the same way.

Wyatt's portrait of the wild, seeming-tame lady owes nothing to either

¹ This information is found as early as da Tempo: see his note in the 1519 edition, f. 103^v. Cf. Vellutello, f. 149^v. A number of commentators also tell the story of how Alexander put collars on stags which were found still living a hundred years later.

² Sonnet iii in Romanello's *Rhythmorum Vulgarium* (?1480), the contents of which are mostly imitations of Petrarch. A. K. Foxwell (ii. 130) suggested Romanello as a possible source for Wyatt's l. 13, though obviously with doubt. The only possible evidence is that both mix vernacular and Latin phrases.

Petrarch or the commentators. All stress Laura's modesty ('pudicitia').¹ Most comment on the moral force of the symbols: the whiteness of the hind indicates Laura's purity, the hind itself is sacred to the chaste Diana, and so on. Wyatt retains only the symbol of the diamonds with which the hind's collar is 'graven': and it is even doubtful whether it has its original force as a symbol of firm resistance to every lascivious desire ('ferma constantia contra ogni ribollimento lascivo').²

Wyatt's lady, in a sense, 'disappears' just as Laura does: at least she is lost to him. But the implications of the disappearance and loss appear to differ widely in the two cases. The view that Petrarch's sonnet is a presage of Laura's death has proved acceptable, in spite of the fact that it occurs rather too early in the sequence. Amongst early interpreters Vellutello says that Laura disappears in passing to the other life ('passando a l'altra vita sparue'); and that her death occurs just before noon because she was then, aged thirty-four, near to the middle of her life ('uicina al mezzo del suo corso uitale') (f. 150^r). The question, however, was not settled by Vellutello. Gesualdo says that the disappearance of Laura could refer either to her death or to her habit of hiding from Petrarch (f. 237^r); while a minor commentator, Silvano da Venafro, is content merely to say that Laura disappeared in the direction of her home: 'ella sparue andandosene nel suo albergo'.³ At least, therefore, it was possible, in Wyatt's day, to interpret this episode more mundanely than Vellutello.

The loss of the lady is naturally closely connected with her relationship to Caesar, whatever it may be. It is certainly possible that Wyatt's sonnet may refer to Henry VIII's appropriation of Anne Boleyn: for in 1526 he did order Wyatt to break off relations with her.⁴ At any rate 'Who so list to hount' describes the loss of a mistress to some lordly husband or master, and the consequent futility, even danger, of pursuing her farther. This will again seem remote from Petrarch's sonnet if it is taken as a presage of Laura's death. For in this view, Laura has been set free from life by Caesar, and Caesar is inevitably God: 'M. L. fatta libera dal suo Cesare, inteso per lo suo & nostro sommo Iddio'.⁵ But, again, Wyatt could have chosen to interpret the sonnet on a more mundane level. Squarciafico cites Filelfo's opinion that Laura was married; and that 'Liberà farmi al mio Cesare parve' is a reference to the imperial law that a married woman is subject to none but her husband: 'per la legge imperiale nessuna donna maritata era

¹ E.g. Squarciafico, f. 103^r.

² Vellutello, f. 149^r.

³ *Il Petrarcha col commento di M. Silvano da Venafro* (Naples, 1533), f. 142^r.

⁴ A. K. Foxwell gives the facts, emphasizing that the extent of Wyatt's intimacy with Anne Boleyn remains unknown (ii. 253-6). F. W. Bateson says that 'Wyatt's hind is Anne Boleyn who was almost certainly his mistress before she was appropriated by Henry VIII': see *English Poetry. A Critical Introduction* (London, 1950), p. 141.

⁵ Vellutello, f. 149^r.

subiecta ad altro che al suo marito' (f. 103^v). This is certainly something more like the relationship that Wyatt has in mind. Gesualdo's comments insist further on the legal danger of tampering with another man's property. Petrarch, he says, alludes to the marriage law decreed by Caesar and means that Laura must suffer no molestation: 'per Cesare intendono la maritale legge da Cesare ordinata . . . che nessuno molesto esser le debba' (f. 237^r). Inclined to follow Vellutello in believing that Laura was unmarried, Gesualdo gives an alternative: in this case the reference is to the law *de Adulteris* of the dictator Julius Caesar: 'la Giulia legge de Adulteris ordinata da Cesare Giulio dittatore.' The explanation that follows becomes so confusing that Gesualdo breaks off with the excuse that it would take too long to expound it fully. It is obviously a fantastic notion. However, the present concern is not to establish the validity of any one interpretation of Sonnet cxc, but to illustrate the variety of interpretations open to a sixteenth-century reader like Wyatt.

The inference is that it was not, as it were, obligatory for Wyatt to read 'Una candida cerva' as an unearthly vision of a sublime lady whose Lord and Maker claimed her for Heaven. It is hardly necessary to add, on the other hand, that the commentaries do not yield the total meaning of 'Who so list to hount'. None equates the virtuous Laura with such a 'wild' court lady as Wyatt describes, or so much as hints that her admirers are wasting their time in loving her; and Filelfo, Vellutello, and Gesualdo would alike have been amazed at so cynical a 'version' of Petrarch's love story. Their freedom in interpretation becomes, perhaps, Wyatt's licence. And, as a born experimenter, as a habitual gleaner of foreign ideas, as a genius, Wyatt would have little difficulty in combining academic notes with his own courtly experience and transforming both into an original poem.

It is not to be supposed that Wyatt had every single one of the available commentaries on Petrarch perpetually before him and that through every year from 1527 to 1541 he pored over them in selective mood. Though I am convinced that he did consult notes on the poems he wanted to translate or imitate, these commentaries could simply be taken to illustrate the climate of Petrarchan opinion in Wyatt's day. In both cases this influence would account for something, though not, of course, everything, in Wyatt's translations and imitations of Petrarch's poems.

THE AUDIENCE OF THE ELIZABETHAN PRIVATE THEATRES

By WILLIAM A. ARMSTRONG

THOUGH the history of regular performances at the Elizabethan private theatres extends from 1575 to 1642, the evidence concerning the audiences who frequented them is limited and fragmentary and has attracted far less attention than that concerning the patrons of the public theatres. In *Shakespeare and the Rival Traditions* (New York, 1952), Alfred Harbage has surveyed some of the evidence about private-theatre audiences relative to the period between 1575 and 1616. The purpose of this article is to examine what can be gleaned from contemporary plays, poems, and pamphlets about the social standing of these audiences, about where they sat and what they paid for their seats, and about the virtues, faults, and foibles which they displayed during the period between 1575 and 1642.

The geography of the private theatres is of some significance, since their situation had an important bearing upon the types of spectator whom they attracted. Whereas the public theatres stood at various points on the periphery of London, the private theatres enjoyed the benefits of relatively central situations. St. Paul's was close to the centre of Elizabethan London and it was there that Sebastian Westcott began in 1575 to stage plays in the Almonry House, a small building behind Convocation House. This private theatre at Paul's was intermittently used until 1609. In 1576 Richard Farrant opened a theatre in the old priory buildings of Blackfriars. This was the first Blackfriars Theatre and was intermittently used until 1584. The second and more famous Blackfriars Theatre was another set of premises in the same area which James Burbage converted into a playhouse in 1596. It was used by juvenile companies until 1608, and afterwards became the indoor theatre used in winter by the leading adult company, the King's Men, until 1642. About 1605 a fourth private theatre was established when Michael Drayton and Thomas Woodford leased a building in Fleet Street which had been part of the monastery of Whitefriars, and converted the old refectory into a theatre which was still in use in 1621. A fifth private theatre was Porter's Hall, situated in the Blackfriars district. It was opened in 1615, but suppressed soon afterwards. Much more important was the Cockpit or Phoenix, a private theatre in the northern part of Drury Lane, which was opened in 1617. The last of the Elizabethan private theatres was the Salisbury Court, a converted barn close to Salis-

bury House in the Whitefriars area, which was opened in 1629. The Cockpit and the Salisbury Court were used until the closing of the theatres in 1642. As this brief survey shows, the private-theatre movement began near the centre of London, then extended westwards. The two Blackfriars theatres and Porter's Hall were within a few minutes' walk of St. Paul's. The two theatres in the Whitefriars area, the Whitefriars and Salisbury Court, were within fifteen minutes' walk of St. Paul's. The Cockpit was farther westwards, but it was, nevertheless, more conveniently situated for fashionable playgoers than the Fortune and the Red Bull, the two public theatres most accessible to patrons travelling from the centre of London.

The choice of central and west-of-centre situations for the private theatres was no doubt partly due to the social character of the surrounding districts. St. Paul's was the hub of social and commercial activities in the daily life of the capital. The middle aisle of Paul's was a fashionable rendezvous for news and gossip both in the mornings and in the afternoons. In his *Historical Memoires on the Reigns of Queen Elizabeth and King James* (London, 1658), Francis Osborn records that

It was then the fashion of those times and did so continue till these . . . for the principall Gentry, Lords, Courtiers, and men of all professions not merely Mechanick, to meet in *Pauls Church* by eleven, and walk in the middle Ile till twelve, and after dinner from three, to six, during which time some discoursed of Businesse, others of Newes. (pp. 64-65)

Lawyers met their clients in the church, book-sellers set up their stalls in the churchyard, and prostitutes frequented both areas, particularly 'the lower end of the Middle Ile'.¹ The nearby Blackfriars district contained a number of aristocratic residences, notably those of Lord Hunsdon (who became Lord Chamberlain in 1597), Lord Cobham, Lady Russell, and Sir Thomas Bendish.² The Whitefriars district a little farther west also boasted aristocratic inhabitants. In addition, it contained the quarter known as Alsatia, which housed a motley community of debtors, bankrupts, criminals, and prostitutes, attracted thither by the old privilege of sanctuary which still protected persons liable to be arrested. Some patrons of the Whitefriars Theatre, as we shall see, were drawn from this community. Only a short distance to the north and the west of Whitefriars were the very different communities of judges, lawyers, serjeants, and students of law who lodged in the Inns of Court. In Fleet Street were Clifford's Inn, the Inner Temple, and the Middle Temple; in Chancery Lane, off Fleet Street, stood Serjeants' Inn; and just west of Fleet Street, in the liberty of Westminster, were Clement's Inn, New Inn, and Lyon's Inn. Like

¹ 'J.H.' in *The House of Correction* (London, 1619), D2^v.

² See C. W. Wallace, *The Children of the Chapel at Blackfriars, 1597-1603* (Lincoln, Nebraska, 1908), pp. 26-27.

236 ARMSTRONG: ELIZABETHAN PRIVATE THEATRES

St. Paul's, the Temple Church was a popular meeting-place for lawyers and their clients. The Cockpit Theatre in Drury Lane was close to this large and wealthy legal fraternity, and even closer to a number of large houses inhabited by nobles, gentry, and their dependents, for, according to a contemporary historian, 'Drury Lane . . . and the Strand were the places where most of the Gentry lived' at this time.¹ On the south side of the Strand at the end of the sixteenth century stood Northumberland House, York House, Durham House (residence of Sir Walter Raleigh), Russell House, Somerset House (later given to Anne of Denmark by James I), and Essex House (residence of the Earl of Essex). Only a short distance north-west of the Strand was the royal residence, St. James's Palace. The private theatres were thus conveniently close to the dwellings and meeting-places of various classes who had the leisure and the money to attend performances. The direct evidence concerning the constitution of their audiences shows that they drew the majority of their patrons from these adjacent districts.

In references to spectators at the private theatres, the aristocracy and the gentry are mentioned more frequently than any other social class. For instance, in his prologue to *Epicoene*, acted at Whitefriars in 1609, Ben Jonson promises 'Lords, Knights, Squires' that he has delicacies suited to their tastes.² The four types of spectator who figure in the Praeludium to Thomas Goffe's *The Careless Shepherdess*, acted at Salisbury Court in the sixteen-thirties, include 'Spruce, a courtier', who speaks as one familiar with the theatre and its plays.³ When the players of Blackfriars, the Cockpit, and Salisbury Court published *The Actors' Remonstrance* in 1643 as a protest against the closing of the theatres, they claimed that 'the best of the Nobility and Gentry' had been their patrons, and nostalgically recalled the 'young Gentlemen that used to feast and frolick with them at Tavernes'.⁴ An interesting representative of the more serious-minded theatregoer of this class is Sir Humphrey Mildmay, who divided his time between his Essex estates and the social round of London. G. E. Bentley's analysis of Mildmay's diary and account-book from 1632 to 1642 shows that he visited theatres regularly and that he had a marked preference for the private theatres. 'It is noticeable', observes Bentley, 'that though he does not, as a rule, give the name of the theatre he visited, Blackfriars is clearly his

¹ Arthur Wilson, *The History of Britain* (London, 1653), p. 146.

² *Epicoene* in *Ben Jonson*, ed. C. H. Herford and Percy Simpson (Oxford, 1925-52), v. 163. This edition of Jonson's works is used throughout and is hereafter referred to as 'Herford and Simpson'.

³ *The Careless Shepherdess* (London, 1656), p. 5. The Praeludium to this play may have been written by Richard Brome; see G. E. Bentley, *The Jacobean and Caroline Stage*, iv (Oxford, 1956), 502-4.

⁴ In *The English Drama and Stage under the Tudor and Stuart Princes*, ed. W. C. Hazlitt (London, 1869), pp. 261, 263.

favourite. He mentions it fourteen times, the Globe four times, and the Cockpit, or Phoenix in Drury Lane, three times. The plays which he refers to by title indicate that he visited the Blackfriars four times and the Cockpit once when no theatre is named.¹ Bentley also notes that Mildmay's preference for the Blackfriars may have been partly due to the fact that his town residence was near this theatre.¹

Overlapping the aristocratic class of patrons to some extent, and no less important to the economy of the private theatres, were the lawyers and members of the Inns of Court who lived and worked so close to these playhouses. Indeed, a significant passage in Thomas Nabbes's prologue to *The Bride*, a play acted at the Cockpit in 1638, goes so far as to ascribe poor attendances to the fact that the law courts were in recess:

*Vacation still: so little custom comes
To buy our Merchandize, and fill our roomes,
It would perswade us but for after hope
Of better takings quite to shut up shop.*²

Correspondingly, the diary written by John Greene when he was keeping his terms at Lincoln's Inn shows that he and his fellow-students especially favoured the Blackfriars and the Cockpit in their theatregoing. In October 1635, for instance, he records that there were '9 or 10 of Lincoln's Inn' at his sister's wedding, that 'we are all ther the two days dinner and supper', and that 'we were at a play, some at cockpit, some at Blackfriars'. In the February of the same year, he records four visits to the Blackfriars and the Cockpit, and the other plays that he mentions having seen in March, April, and June 1635 can all be allocated to the repertoires of the Blackfriars and the Cockpit.³ It is likewise significant that one of the four types of playgoer portrayed in the Praeludium to Goffe's *The Careless Shepherdess* at Salisbury Court is 'Spark, an Inns of Court gentleman' who claims an up-to-date knowledge of 'The Laws of Comedy and Tragedy', Plot, Wit, and 'the round language of the Theater' (p. 4). It is not surprising to find that the most detailed contemporary description of a private theatre audience—*Certaine Observations at Blackfryers* (1617)—was written by a lawyer, Henry Fitzgeoffrey, 'Of Lincolnes-Inn Gent', as he styles himself on his title-page.

Ladies of the upper classes evidently constituted an influential proportion of the private theatre audiences, for their attention and favour are solicited with some frequency in prologues. The prologue to Jonson's Whitefriars comedy, *Epicoene*, contains an assurance that his offerings 'Be

¹ G. E. Bentley, *The Jacobean and Caroline Stage*, ii (Oxford, 1941), 680. This work is hereafter referred to as 'G. E. Bentley'.

² London, 1640, A4^v.

³ E. M. Symonds, 'The Diary of John Greene (1635-57)', *E.H.R.*, xliii (1928), 386-9.

fit for ladies', and in his prologue to *The Ladies' Privilege*, acted at the Cockpit, Henry Glapthorne includes this respectful appeal:

*Ladies if you praise not
At least allow his language and his plot
Your own just Priviledge.*¹

Most of John Fletcher's prologue to his Blackfriars comedy, *Rule a Wife and Have a Wife*, is an arch address to the ladies in his audience, whom he invites to 'hold your Fannes close, and then smile at ease' when anything *risqué* happens on the stage.² Thomas Nabbes shows a more serious concern for feminine sensibilities in his prologue to *Hannibal and Scipio*, a Cockpit play, in which he promises that 'Ladies shall not blush Nor smile under their fannes' at anything in his tragedy.³ Incidentally, masks as well as fans hid their blushes at times. In *The Staple of News*, Jonson has a description of a young lady attending a play and seeing 'a little o' the vanity through her masque'.⁴

The country gentleman was an occasional patron of the private theatres, though a somewhat uneasy one, to judge by some references to him. In John Webster's Induction to *The Malcontent*, a Blackfriars play by John Marston, Sly retorts to the Tireman, 'We may sit vpon the stage at the priuate house: thou doest not take me for a country gentleman, doest? doest thinke I feare hissing?'⁵ Landlord, 'a country gentleman', is one of the four types of spectator represented in the Praeludium to Goffe's *The Careless Shepherdess*, but his simple tastes are ridiculed by Spruce, the courtier, and Spark, the Inns of Court man, and he decides to stay at the Salisbury Court only 'that I may view the Ladies, and they me' (p. 6). Other patrons can be allocated to a miscellaneous class of persons on the fringe of the gentry. Jonson includes a captain and a gamester in his list of those who failed to appreciate John Fletcher's *The Faithful Shepherdess* at Blackfriars.⁶ In his account of the Blackfriars audience, Fitzgeoffrey mentions a loquacious traveller and a boastful soldier, Captain Martio.⁷ In his twelfth epigram, Jonson satirizes the fraudulent 'Lieutenant Shift', who haunts Whitefriars, goes 'to plays, Calls for his stool, and adorns the stage'.⁸

References to middle-class patrons of the private theatre are significantly scanty. In his prologue to *Epicœne* Jonson addresses women of this class

¹ London, 1640, A3^v.

² Oxford, 1640, A2^r.

³ London, 1637, A3^v.

⁴ Herford and Simpson, vi. 303.

⁵ London, 1604, A3^r.

⁶ 'To the worthy Author' in *The Faithful Shepherdess* (London, 1634), A2^v.

⁷ Henry Fitzgeoffrey, *Satyres and Satyricall Epigrams: With Certaine Observations at Blackfryers* (London, 1617), E7^v, E8^v.

⁸ Herford and Simpson, viii. 30.

when he says that he is offering something suited to the taste of 'city-wires'.¹ 'City wire' was a term applied at this time to a London woman of the citizen class because she wore a ruff supported by wire, a fashion which distinguished her from the noblewoman. The four women who comment on the play in the Induction and Intermeans of Jonson's *The Staple of News* are portraits of bourgeois spectators of this kind, for though they claim to be gentlewomen they chatter like city wives, comparing Pennyboy to an alderman and the 'staple of news' to gossip from the bake-house.² Most playgoers from the lower middle class seem to have preferred the public playhouses to the private theatres. At any rate Thrift, the tradesman who figures in the Praeludium to Goffe's *The Careless Shepherdess*, decides that the price of admission to the Salisbury Court is too high and retrieves his money in order to go to the Red Bull or the Fortune (p. 8).

In John Marston's comedy, *Jack Drum's Entertainment*, acted at Paul's, Planet praises the selectness of the audiences at that theatre:

Ifaith I like the audience that frequenteth there
With much applause: A man shall not be choakte
With the stench of Garlicke, nor be pasted
To the barmy Iacket of a Beer-brewer.³

Despite this remark, however, there is evidence that some members of the working classes attended the private theatres, even though the cheapest seats there cost sixpence and were thus six times dearer than a place in the yard of a public theatre. In his list of the Blackfriars critics of *The Faithful Shepherdess*, Jonson includes 'the shops Foreman, or some such brave sparke That may judge for his sixe-pence' (A2^v), and in *The Magnetic Lady*, which he wrote for the same theatre, he refers scornfully to the 'grounds of your people, that sit in the oblique caves and wedges of your house, your sinfull sixe-penny Mechanicks'.⁴ Jonson also indicates that there were theatregoers from Alsatia; in his prologue to *Epicoene* he offers entertainment to 'your men, and daughters of white-Friars'.⁵ By 'daughters of white-Friars' he probably means the prostitutes of Alsatia. A 'Cheapside dame' of the same profession is mentioned in Fitzgeoffrey's description of the Blackfriars audience,⁶ and the authors of *The Actors' Remonstrance* make it clear that women of this kind continued to visit the private theatres until they were closed in 1642, for they promise 'never to admit into our six-penny-rooms those unwholesome enticing harlots that sit there meereley to be taken up by Prentizes or Lawyers Clerks' (p. 265). This remark shows that 'Mechanicks' and 'the shops Foreman' were not the only members of the working class to visit private theatres. It is certain, however,

¹ Ibid., v. 163.

² London, 1601, H3^v.

³ Ibid., v. 163.

⁴ Ibid., vi. 343, 344.

⁵ Herford and Simpson, vi. 509.

⁶ *Observations*, F1^r-F1^v.

that such patrons constituted only a small minority of the private theatre audience.

Little is known of the auditoria of Paul's, the first Blackfriars, Whitefriars, and Porter's Hall. The small theatre at Paul's may have provided only two kinds of accommodation for spectators; benches on the floor of the auditorium and stools on the stage. At the second Blackfriars, the Cockpit, and Salisbury Court, however, there appear to have been seats for spectators in five places: on the stage, in the pit, in the boxes, in the middle gallery, and in the top gallery. The top gallery was partitioned into sections called 'rooms' in which seats were available at sixpence each; these, as I have just shown, were occupied by plebeian members of the audience. In *Certain Observations at Blackfryers* (E7^v) Fitzgeoffrey describes Captain Martio as being in 'the middle Region', which probably means the middle gallery. A seat in a 'room' in this gallery cost a shilling. In the Praeludium to *The Careless Shepherdess*, acted at Salisbury Court, Landlord, the country gentleman, remarks that there are 'None that be worthy of my company / In any room beneath the twelvepenny' (p. 3), thus indicating that the place he is going to take is above the boxes. The diary and account book of Sir Humphrey Mildmay show that he occasionally occupied a seat in a twelvepenny room at the Cockpit and Blackfriars.¹ A seat in the boxes cost half a crown. This fact is established by a play acted at Blackfriars and the Cockpit, Fletcher's *Wit without Money*, in which an old retainer reminds a prodigal gallant of those 'who extold you in the halfe crowne boxes, where you might sit and muster all the beauties . . .'² As this passage indicates, the boxes were the special resort of men and women of fashion. Sometimes the seats in certain boxes were taken *en bloc* for special parties; in Philip Massinger's comedy *The City Madam* Anne makes it one of the conditions of her marriage-bargain with Sir Maurice Lacey to have 'The private Box took up at a new Play For me, and my retinue'.³ The boxes were also especially favoured by gentlemen of the Inns of Court. In his epigram *In Rufum* Sir John Davies refers to the Blackfriars theatre and notes that 'the clamorous frie of Innes of court / Filles vp the priuate roomes of greater prise'.⁴

From other passages it can be inferred that a place on a bench in the pit cost eighteen pence and that the total cost of a stool on the stage was two shillings. In an epilogue written for the Blackfriars production of *The City Match*, Jasper Mayne declares that his play was not for those 'Who if they speak not ill oth' *Poet*, doubt / They loose by th' Play, nor have their two shillings out', but for those 'who did true Hearers sit / Who singly make

¹ See G. E. Bentley, ii. 675, 677.

² London, 1639, B2^v.

³ London, 1658, p. 27.

⁴ *The Poems of Sir John Davies*, ed. C. Howard (New York, 1941), p. 35.

a box, and fill the Pit'¹—a remark which separates those who paid two shillings from those who sat in the boxes or the pit, and thus gives warrant for the belief that two shillings was the price of a seat on the stage. That there were places in the auditorium priced at eighteen pence is proved by Sir Humphrey Mildmay's records, which show that he paid this amount at Blackfriars on 21 January, and at the Cockpit on 20 March 1633/4.² On these occasions he very probably sat in the pit. Damplay, the censorious gallant in Jonson's *The Magnetic Lady*, is probably referring to the prices of seats in the pit and on the stage, respectively, when he talks of giving 'eighteene pence, or two shillings' for a seat.³ Drawing attention to an allusion to 'twelvepenny-stool gentlemen' in *The Roaring Girl* by Dekker and Middleton, Alfred Harbage has suggested that the spectator who sat on the stage paid a shilling as entrance-fee and a shilling for the stool which he hired on the stage,⁴ but there are several references to sixpence as the amount paid for a stool on the stage. The boy who offers to bring a stool for the supposed gallant on the stage in the Induction to Jonson's *Cynthia's Revels*, a Blackfriars play, asks for 'sixe pence'.⁵ Dekker's description of the gallant at the playhouse in *The Guls Horne-book* applies to both public and private theatres, and includes the following advice: 'By sitting on the stage you may (with small cost) purchase the deere acquaintance of the boyes: have a good stoole for sixpence. . . .'⁶ In *Jonsonus Virbius*, Ralph Brideoak is evidently referring to gallants who hired stools on the stage for sixpence when he remarks,

Though the fine *Plush* and *Velvets* of the age
Did oft for sixpence damne thee from the Stage.⁷

It therefore seems probable that the spectator who sat on the stage of a private theatre first paid eighteen pence, the price of admission to the pit, and then sixpence for a stool on the stage. Stools on the stage were much favoured by courtiers, wits, dandies, and men-about-town. In England, as C. W. Wallace has shown, the custom of sitting on the stage began at Blackfriars in 1597 or 1598.⁸ It was prevalent until 1762, when Garrick abolished it at Drury Lane.

In the Induction to Jonson's *Bartholomew Fair*, which was first acted at a public theatre, the Hope, in 1614, the Scrivener declares that 'it shall bee lawfull for any man to iudge his six pen'orth, his twelue pen'orth, so to his eighteene pence, 2. shillings, halfe a crowne, to the value of his place:

¹ Oxford, 1639, S2^r.

² Herford and Simpson, vi. 545.

³ *Shakespeare and the Rival Traditions*, p. 45.

⁴ Herford and Simpson, iv. 10.

⁷ Herford and Simpson, xi. 467.

² G. E. Bentley, ii. 675-6.

⁶ London, 1609, p. 29.

⁸ *Children of the Chapel*, pp. 131-4.

Provided alwaies his place get not about his wit'.¹ In his note on this passage, Dr. Simpson suggests that these prices were actually charged at the Hope when this comedy was first performed.² But as the prices specified by Jonson are precisely those which, as I have tried to demonstrate above, were charged for seats in the private theatres, it would seem that Jonson was proudly informing his public-theatre patrons that they could only sit in judgement upon him if they paid higher prices—those of the private theatres.

During the latter half of the sixty-seven years of their history the Elizabethan private theatres evidently attracted more playgoers, since performances in them became more frequent then. Harbage has shown that during the first decade of the seventeenth century performances at Blackfriars and Paul's were being given only once a week; on Saturdays at Blackfriars, probably on Mondays at Paul's (p. 44). The latest piece of evidence that he cites derives from a legal dispute which occurred in 1608. Up to that time the private theatres had been used only by companies of boy actors. Shortly afterwards, however, the King's Men began to perform at Blackfriars, and the Cockpit and Salisbury Court were used mainly by adult professional players throughout their history. One result of this displacement of the boy by the adult actor was an increase in the frequency of performances in private theatres. In the address by John Hemming and Henry Condell which prefaces the First Folio of Shakespeare's plays there is a reference to those wits who 'sit on the Stage at *Black-friers*, or the *Cock-pit*, to arraign Playes dailie', which certainly suggests that by 1623 performances at these two private theatres were being given more frequently than once every seven days. Mildmay's diary and account-book contain irrefutable evidence that performances at Blackfriars were more frequent than once a week in the sixteen-thirties. They show that in 1633/4 he visited this theatre on successive days—21 and 22 January—and that in 1635 he saw two performances there within four days—on 25 and 28 April.³

The evidence concerning the behaviour of the private theatre audiences is limited and biased. Most of it is a satirical commentary on their faults and eccentricities from the point of view of the dramatists who wrote for them. The type of spectator who evoked more comment than any other was the gallant or would-be gallant who occupied a stool on the stage. Surprisingly, the inconvenience of having spectators on the stages of these relatively small theatres is seldom mentioned; the speaker of the Blackfriars prologue to Jonson's *The Devil is an Ass* grumbles because the grandees on the stage 'thrust and spurne,/And knocke vs o' the elbowes',⁴ but this is an isolated complaint. The dramatists had two main criticisms of the

¹ Herford and Simpson, vi. 15.

² G. E. Bentley, ii. 675, 677.

³ *Ibid.*, x. 174-5.

⁴ Herford and Simpson, vi. 163.

gallants on the stage: first, that their rich attire and ostentatious mannerisms distracted attention from the play; secondly, that they regarded themselves as supreme arbiters of taste and behaved so disdainfully and hypercritically in the theatre that they sometimes ruined the performance. There was clearly much justification for the first of these criticisms because it is supported by the independent testimony of Henry Fitzgeoffrey. In his *Observations at Blackfryers* (F1v-F2v) he describes one playhouse dandy who wears a Holland shirt, a French-cut suit, Spanish boots, and Scottish spurs, and another who is so richly dressed that his annual income 'Is not of worth to purchase such a *Sute*'. Playgoers of this kind, complains Glapthorne, 'come but to be scene: Not see or heare the Play',¹ and in *The Devil is an Ass* Jonson satirizes them in the person of Fitzdottrel, who puts on a cloak worth fifty pounds to visit the playhouse and tells his wife,

To day I goe to the *Black-fryers Play-house*,
 Sit i' the view, salute all my acquaintance,
 Rise vp betweene the *Acts*, let fall my cloake,
 Publish a handsome man, and a rich suite
 (As that's a speciall end, why we goe thither,
 All that pretend, to stand for't o' the *Stage*)
 The Ladies aske who's that? (For, they doe come
 To see vs, *Loue*, as wee doe to see them).²

The playhouse dandy sometimes became the dupe of his own vanity. The authors of *The Actors' Remonstrance* confess to 'borrowing money at first sight of punie gallants' and to 'praising their swords, belts, and beavers, so to invite them to bestow them upon us . . .' (p. 261).

References to the censoriousness of the gallant on the stage are even more numerous than allusions to the ostentation of his dress and manners. Even the First Folio of Shakespeare had to be protected against his carping; Heming and Condell warn him that 'though you be a Magistrate of wit, and sit on the Stage at *Black-Friers*, or the *Cock-pit*, to arraigne Playes dailie, know, these Playes haue had their triall already and stood out all appeales . . .'. A few years earlier Thomas Dekker had ironically informed gallants that 'By sitting on the stage, you haue a signd pattent to engrosse the whole commodity of Censure; may lawfully presume to be a Girder', and had shown how they could belittle plays by talking noisily during a performance, or by laughing in the middle of a tragedy, or by rising 'with a skrued and discontented face from your stoole' and drawing 'what troope you can from the stage after you'.³ Behaviour of the latter kind was a serious matter to the dramatists, for it could effectively damn a play; as George Chapman put it,

¹ *Ladies' Privilege*, A3^v.

² Herford and Simpson, vi. 178.

³ *Guls Horne-book*, pp. 28, 30, 31.

if our other audience see
You on the stage depart before we end,
Our wits goe with you all, and we are fooles.¹

The boldest opponent of the hypercritical gallants was Ben Jonson, who campaigned against them throughout his career as a playwright. In the Induction to *Cynthia's Revels*, for instance, the Third Child parodies the grumbling of the disdainful gallant who finds fault with the smallness of the boy actors, rails at the music and the playwright, and professes to find pleasure only in tobacco.² The same type of spectator is satirized again in the Induction and Intermeans of *The Magnetic Lady*, where Damplay exhibits not only the gallant's ignorance of the principles of effective comic writing, but also his habit of assuming that certain characters on the stage must be libellous portraits of living people, and his scorn for all attempts to educate him: 'I will censure and be witty, and take my Tobacco, and enjoy my *Magna Charta* of reprehension, as my Predecessors have done before me.'³ Jonson created this character when he was still smarting from the failure of *The New Inn* at Blackfriars in 1629, a failure which he attributed in his dedication to that play to 'a hundred fastidious *impertinents*, who were there present the first day' and came only 'To see, and to bee seene. To make a generall muster of themselves in their clothes of credit: and possesse the Stage against the Play. To dislike all, but marke nothing. And by their confidence of rising between the Actes, in oblique lines, make *affidavit* to the whole house, of their not vnderstanding one Scene.'⁴ Here we have a pungent summary of all the main criticisms of the gallant who sat on the stage.

By no means all the gallants who frequented the private theatres were as perverse and hostile as these criticisms would suggest, however. Due allowance must be made for the exaggerations of exasperated playwrights. *The New Inn* is not a good play. And Jonson himself represents in the Induction to *Cynthia's Revels* a 'more sober, or better gather'd gallant' who speaks as a 'well-wisher to the house' and pleads reasonably for plays with fewer borrowings from old books and 'common stages'.⁵ Another portrait of the same kind of spectator is Probee in *The Magnetic Lady*. Probee, like Damplay, is a man of fashion, but his reactions to the play are very different from his companion's; he deplores the malicious custom of assuming that living people are caricatured in plays and is content 'to wait the processe, and events of things, as the *Poet* presents them . . .'.⁶ Probee is, no doubt, representative of such fashionable playgoers as Thomas Randolph, Thomas Carew, and John Cleveland, all of whom wrote in

¹ Prologue to *All Fooles* (London, 1605), A3^v.

² *Ibid.*, vi. 564.

³ *Ibid.*, iv. 39, 41.

⁴ Herford and Simpson, iv. 39.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 397.

⁶ *Ibid.*, vi. 544, 578.

defence of Jonson after the failure of *The New Inn*. Indeed, clagues were not unknown in the private theatres, as may be deduced from Thomas Nabbes's declaration in a Cockpit prologue that

*He hath no faction in a partiall way
Prepar'd to cry it up, and boast the Play.*¹

Like some of the gallants, some women of fashion were accused of treating the private theatre as primarily a place for the exhibition of fine clothes. In the bargaining-scene with Sir Maurice Lacey in Massinger's *The City Madam*, for instance, Anne demands not only a private box at the theatre but also

a fresh habit
Of a fashion never seen before, to draw
The gallants' eyes that sit on the stage, upon me. (p. 27)

The most detailed portrayal of the behaviour of feminine spectators occurs in the Induction and Intermeans of Jonson's Blackfriars comedy, *The Staple of News*. Again, allowance must be made for the calculated exaggerations of the satirist. The names of the four women represented—Censure, Tattle, Curiosity, and Mirth—are in themselves a commentary. All four are described as 'gossips', and their vapid and inconsequent chatter obviously parodies the loquacity of some of the women in Jonson's audience. Like Massinger's Anne, moreover, they come to the theatre 'to see, and to be seene'. Like one sort of gallant, Censure professes exceptionally high standards of histrionic judgement and assumes that the play contains sly references to living persons when none are intended.² The actors' costumes constitute the chief common interest of these gossips. Curiosity watches the performance for incongruities of costume, for 'what *King* playes without cuffes? and his *Queene* without glooues? who rides post in stockings? and daunces in bootes?'³ Tattle, on the other hand, is all for fine dress whether it be appropriate or not: 'I cannot abide that nasty fellow, the *Begger*', she remarks at the end of the first act, 'if hee had beene a *Court-Begger* in good clothes; a *Begger* in veluet, as they say, I could have endur'd him'.⁴ Censure, despite the high critical standards that she professes, is likewise much influenced by the clothes worn by the actors; at the end of the fourth act, for instance, she protests her love for Master Fitton because 'He did weare all he had, from the hat-band to the shooe-tie, so politically . . .'.⁵ Jonson's satire here had a basis of fact, for the authors of *The Actors' Remonstrance* number among their former patrons 'those Buxsome and Bountifull Lasses that usually were enamoured on the

¹ *Covent Garden* (London, 1638), A4^r.

² Herford and Simpson, vi. 279, 280, 323-4.

³ *Ibid.*, 280.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 302.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 363.

persons of the younger sort of Actors, for the good cloaths they wore upon the stage, believing them really to be the persons they did only represent' (p. 263). This credulity is a contrast to the sophistication of other patrons of the private theatres, and shows that some members of their audiences were no less subject to theatrical delusion than the butcher who during a performance of a play about Greeks and Trojans at the Red Bull so sympathized with Hector that he climbed on to the stage in order to protect him from Achilles and his men.¹

There is little detailed evidence about the tastes and behaviour of other classes of private-theatre patrons. Landlord, the country gentleman in the Praeludium to *The Careless Shepherdess*, delights most of all in clowns and would 'have the Fool in every Act' (p. 5). Thrift, the tradesman, agrees with him, but they are told not to expect such outmoded crudities at Salisbury Court and are left dissatisfied. Another old-fashioned preference is criticized by Jonson in his Induction to *Cynthia's Revels*—the playgoer with 'more beard then braine' swears 'That the old Hieronimo (as it was first acted) was the onely best, and iudiciously pend play of Europe'.² (A clue to the social class of this playgoer is provided in *Every Man in His Humour*, where Bobadil, the boastful captain, declares that *The Spanish Tragedy* (i.e. *Hieronimo*) is far superior to any modern play, and has Mathew read it to him while he is dressing.)³ Landlord, Thrift, and Jonson's admirer of *Hieronimo* represent types of theatre-goer who went more frequently to the public than to the private theatres because their tastes had been formed by plays written for public playhouses. Though the dramatists of the private theatres seldom praise their audiences, they certainly prided themselves on writing for patrons with tastes more cultivated than those of the audiences of the public theatres. A valuable illustration of this attitude is provided by James Shirley's prologue to *The Doubtful Heir*. Shirley had expected that the King's Men would present this play at Blackfriars in 1640, and his prologue expresses his disappointment that it is being staged at the Globe instead. It also implies a contrast between the patrons of Blackfriars, who can appreciate wit, 'language clean', and a logical plot, and the audience of the famous public theatre, who take pleasure chiefly in dances, combats, bawdry, clowns, fireworks, and devils:

*Our Author did not calculate this Play
For this Meridian; the Banckside, he knows
Are far more skilfull at the Ebbes and flows
Of water, than of wit, he does not mean
For the elevation of your poles, this scene.*

¹ Edmund Gayton, *Festivious Notes upon Don Quixote* (London, 1654), p. 3.

² Herford and Simpson, iv. 42.

³ *Ibid.*, iii. 319.

*No shews, no dance, and what you most delight in
 Grave understanders, here's no target fighting
 Upon the Stage, all work for Cutlers barr'd,
 No Bawdery, nor no Ballets; this goes hard;
 But language clean, and what affects you not,
 Without impossibilities the Plot;
 No clown, no squibs, no Devill in't: oh now
 You Squirrels that want Nuts, what will you do?¹*

It would seem that by 1640 the more discriminating playgoers were going to the private theatres. Among them were purists who scorned any kind of stage spectacle. Glapthorne complains of patrons of the Cockpit who say 'They only come to heare, not see the Play'.² At Blackfriars there were fastidious critics of gesture and deportment. Fitzgeoffrey mentions certain connoisseurs of histrionic style there who condemned the raising of a hat with a flourish as a 'hateful *Gesture*' and a low bow as 'Affecting Proud Humility' (B7^v).

A favourite intellectual exercise of patrons of private theatres was to try to find points of resemblance between characters in the play and well-known personalities of London. Scandalous speculation of this kind was not confined to a few spectators like Jonson's Damplay and Censure; it was evidently a common practice. 'Application, is now, growne a trade with many', complains Jonson in his dedication to *Volpone*, 'and there are, that professe to haue a key for the decyphering of euerything: but let wise and noble persons take heed how they be too credulous. . .'.³ Similar warnings against malicious personal applications were issued by Webster⁴ and Fletcher⁵ at Blackfriars and by Nabbes⁶ at the Cockpit, but the playwrights were not as innocent as they pretended to be. Jonson's plays, for instance, contain many satirical references to living persons. Damplay is one of his several attempts to ridicule Inigo Jones.⁷ In one play alone—*The Devil is an Ass*—there are sarcastic references to such well-known London quacks, astrologers, and almanac-makers as Thomas Bretnor, Edward Gresham, Abraham Savory, Nicholas Fiske, and Simon Foreman.⁸ Small wonder, then, that 'decyphering' was so popular a practice among playgoers. Examples of it occur in the writings of John Aubrey and Margaret Cavendish, Duchess of Newcastle. According to Aubrey, Subtle in *The*

¹ London, 1652, A3^r.

² *Ladies' Privilege*, A3^v.

³ Herford and Simpson, v. 18–19.

⁴ Induction to John Marston's *The Malcontent* (London, 1604), A3^v–A4^r.

⁵ Prologue to *The Chances* in F. Beaumont and J. Fletcher's *Comedies and Tragedies* (London, 1647), p. 21.

⁶ Prologue to *The Bride* (London, 1640), A4^v.

⁷ The association of Damplay with Vitruvius (Herford and Simpson, v. 510) is calculated to identify him with Inigo Jones.

⁸ See Herford and Simpson, vi. 225–7.

Alchemist represented John Dee: Carlo Buffone in *Every Man out of His Humour* represented Charles Chester, 'a perpetuall talker' who likewise had his lips sealed with wax; and Volpone represented a certain Thomas Sutton who had 'fed severall with hopes of being his Heire'.¹ Margaret Duchess of Newcastle also identifies Subtle in *The Alchemist* with John Dee, Face with Edward Kelly, Doll Common and the widow with Mrs. Dee and Mrs. Kelly, the Spaniard with the Spanish ambassador, and Sir Epicure Mammon with a Polish lord.² Most of these attributions are erroneous but they show how avid the search for personalities could be. Sometimes spectators disapproved of a personal reference which they believed that they had detected and hissed the playwright. Jonson suffered in this way when *The New Inn* was performed at Blackfriars; the spectators saw a special significance in the name 'Cis' which he had given to the chambermaid, and they expressed their displeasure accordingly. In a defensive epilogue written soon afterwards, Jonson hopes for audiences 'Such as will not hiss / Because the chambermaid was named *Cis*', and disclaims any personal reference, protesting that *Cis* 'only meant was, for a girle of wit'. He subsequently changed the name 'Cis' to 'Pru'.³

One result of the personal references in plays written for private theatres was that some members of the audience came equipped with table-books in order to note down items for scandalous gossip. In his prologue to a Blackfriars play, *The Custom of the Country*, Fletcher asserts that there is nothing in it for the man

that brings his Table-booke
To write down, what againe he may repeate
At some great Table, to deserve his meate,⁴

and the same playwright in his prologue to a Paul's play, *The Woman Hater*, issues a similar warning to those 'lurking amongst you in corners, with Table bookes, who haue some hope to find fit matter to feede . . . mallice on'.⁵ Not all the devotees of table-books were of this malicious breed, however. Some playgoers brought them in order to note down jests and witticisms from the plays. Sly, in Webster's Induction to *The Malcontent*, represents one of these; he has seen the play often, he remarks, and has 'most of the ieasts heere in my table-booke' (A3v). A playgoer of the same kind is mentioned by Nabbes in the prologue to his Cockpit tragedy, *Hannibal and Scipio*, where he announces that 'Ladies shall not blush' at his play

¹ *Brief Lives*, ed. A. Clark (Oxford, 1898), i. 214; ii. 184, 246.

² *The Description of a New World* (London, 1668), p. 66.

³ Herford and Simpson, vi. 491, 391.

⁴ Beaumont and Fletcher, *Comedies and Tragedies*, p. 25.

⁵ London, 1607, A2^r.

*nor he in plush
That from the Poets labours in the pit
Informes himselfe for th' exercise of wit
At Tavernes, gather notes. (A3^v)*

Though there are few direct descriptions of the audiences of the Elizabethan private theatres, there is sufficient evidence to warrant the belief that they were mainly drawn from those parts of London adjacent to the theatres and that they consisted mainly of courtiers, gentlemen of the Inns of Court, wits, and women of fashion, together with such hangers-on as gamblers, soldiers, prostitutes, and would-be gallants. Citizens and artisans were in a minority, partly because of the relatively high prices of seats, partly because the plays were not entirely to their taste. The social constitution of the audience was therefore more like that of the Restoration theatres than that of the Elizabethan public playhouses. The arrogant manners and arbitrary judgements of some of the gallants, the presence of ladies in masks, the influence of cliques, and the general interest in personal applications also link this audience with that of the Restoration period. On the other hand, there is no evidence that the private theatre audiences were ever guilty of the licentious and riotous behaviour which sometimes occurred in the Restoration theatres. This difference was, no doubt, partly due to the indefinable leaven of Jonson's 'better-gather'd gallants' whose Jacobean or Caroline culture was more refined than that of their Restoration counterparts, though a comprehensive explanation of it would require an excursion into social and political history beyond the scope of this essay.

THE ORIGIN OF *A RELATION OF THE IMPRISONMENT OF MR. JOHN BUNYAN*

By ROGER SHARROCK

AMONG Bunyan's works *A Relation of the Imprisonment of Mr. John Bunyan* has received little independent attention. Yet it has the interest of being the only authenticated work of Bunyan which was not published in his lifetime or by his literary executors soon after his death; it remained in manuscript in the possession of his family and only appeared in print in 1765. It is also of some literary and historical importance: most biographers of Bunyan have relied on the vivid and immediate account of his arrest and examination before the magistrates, and for the subsequent report of his second wife's courageous intervention on his behalf with the Assize judges in August 1661. Indeed it is from the *Relation* rather than from *Grace Abounding*, the autobiography proper, that the heroic saga of Bunyan's resistance for conscience' sake has been derived. Apart from one or two anecdotes which have become famous, like that of the bell-ringing, *Grace Abounding* is a work bare of external incident because of its overriding concern with the life of the soul. But *A Relation* is full of action and dialogue and it has provided the Bunyan saga with a body of salient dramatic incidents, just as our popular impression of Nelson derives ultimately from the stories preserved in Southey's life.

The problem demanding attention, which has never really been considered by Bunyan scholarship, is why *A Relation* should exist at all as an independent autobiographical narrative. It covers the events from Bunyan's arrest at Samsell in November 1660 to his failure to have his case brought up at the Assizes and thus obtain release in March 1662. This duplicates the concluding sections of *Grace Abounding*, where the same part of his history is dealt with in a much more summary fashion; in neither account does Bunyan carry the story beyond the early months of his imprisonment. The last approach to a time reference, though a very vague one, in *Grace Abounding* (1666) is in § 266:

I will tell you a pretty business. I was once above all the rest in a very sad and low Condition for many weeks; at which time also I being but a young Prisoner and not acquainted with the Laws, had this much lay upon my Spirit, That my Imprisonment might end at the Gallows for aught that I could tell.

The spiritual autobiographies of Nonconformist preachers usually follow a regular mode of proceeding which varies but little in the topics included

from one writer to another, though the treatment of experience may exhibit individual peculiarities (for example, most of the autobiographies describe a period of spiritual temptation involving the writer's fear lest he has committed the sin against the Holy Ghost, but few analyse this period with the obsessed detail displayed by Bunyan).¹ We should expect an account of trial and imprisonment to appear in the full autobiography, and not elsewhere. Such accounts begin to be included in the autobiographies from the time of the first application of the Conventicle Acts after the Restoration, and in the case of the Quakers from the commencement of their mission. They form a regular feature of this class of writings and the pattern they follow is often that of a verbatim account with the speeches assigned to the several participants; this method is followed, for instance, in *The Life and Death of Mr. Vavasor Powell* in reporting the interchanges between Powell and the justice.²

Why then did Bunyan not incorporate this material in *Grace Abounding*, even if he had somewhat to curtail it for reasons of space? One reason for singling out this particular series of episodes for separate treatment may be suggested: Bunyan might have written *A Relation* before settling down in prison to the composition of his spiritual autobiography and in order to draw the attention of fellow church members and well-wishers to a signal episode in his career. But if this were the case it is hard to see why he did not publish the narrative at some period between 1662 and 1666. Nearly all his minor works have a clearly defined pastoral function and were written for publication; even the sermons reached the press sooner or later. It would be doubtful guess-work to suggest that he became more interested in writing a complete autobiography before he sent the earlier work to the press and therefore put it aside; this would not explain why a summary of his prison experience is substituted for the detailed relation, nor why in *Grace Abounding* a new emphasis is introduced into the story, his fear of the punishment of death and how he managed to overcome it: if *A Relation* is closer to the actual events we should hardly expect these psychological considerations to be absent, especially from a narrative imbued with so authentic a sense of the immediate. But *A Relation* remained in manuscript until 1765. The question of the purpose for which the work was designed is therefore likely to be connected with the reason why publication was

¹ See W. Y. Tindall, *John Bunyan, Mechanick Preacher* (Columbia, 1934), pp. 22-38; William Haller, *The Rise of Puritanism* (Columbia, 1938), chap. iii; Roger Sharrock, 'Spiritual Autobiography in *The Pilgrim's Progress*', *R.E.S.* xxiv (1948), 102-20; Owen Watkins, 'Some Early Quaker Autobiographies', *Journal of the Friends' Historical Society*, xlv (1953), 65-74; L. D. Lerner, 'Puritanism and the Spiritual Autobiography', *Hibbert Journal*, lv (1956-7), 373-86; also Owen Watkins, 'Puritan Spiritual Autobiographies 1650-1700' (University of London M.A. thesis, 1951).

² *The Life and Death of Mr. Vavasor Powell* (1671), pp. 134-8: a report of his examination before the Deputy Lieutenants at Cardiff.

withheld in the author's lifetime. Some light may be shed on both matters by considering first, what is known about the manuscript, and secondly, certain hitherto unnoticed features of the work itself, particularly the titled sections into which it is divided.

No autographs of Bunyan are known to survive other than those pages of the *Church Book of Bunyan Meeting* which are conjecturally in his hand and a few signatures.¹ The claim of the title-page of *A Relation*, 'Written by Himself', is substantiated by a contemporary witness, Joseph Gurney; his testimony appears to have passed unnoticed by John Brown, his reviser F. M. Harrison, and other biographers of Bunyan. It is contained in a letter written to the *Evangelical Magazine* in 1813 (p. 148):

Rev. Sir,

Having heard that some persons doubt the authenticity of a small publication entitled 'A Relation of the Imprisonment of Mr. John Bunyan', printed in the year 1765, I beg leave to lay before your readers the following circumstances of its publication:—I accompanied my late honoured father in his annual visit to his relations and friends in Bedfordshire in the summer of 1765. When at Bedford, my father was informed that a granddaughter of Mr. John Bunyan's had a manuscript of her grandfather's, for which she wished to find a purchaser. She was aged and infirm. My father and I went to her lodging and she delivered the manuscript to my father in my presence, requesting him to sell it. The manuscript was in Mr. Bunyan's handwriting. The copy was very fair; and it was sewed up in a little book.

When my father returned to London, he offered it to several booksellers; but the late Mr. Buckland was the only person who was willing to purchase it: he gave five guineas for it, which the poor woman joyfully accepted; and Mr. Buckland immediately printed it.

Yours etc.

Walworth.

JOSEPH GURNEY.

Joseph Gurney's father who negotiated for the book was Thomas Gurney (1705–70)² the inventor of a system of shorthand, the first shorthand-writer to the House of Commons and the Law Courts, and the author of many manuals on the subject. His son succeeded him in his official position. The positive assertion that the work was in Bunyan's hand is most striking. The lady the book was obtained from was Hannah Bunyan, and she was the great-granddaughter, not the granddaughter, of Bunyan; she was the granddaughter of Bunyan's son by his first wife; this son was also called John and died in 1728. Hannah Bunyan was born in 1694 and died in

¹ *The Church Book of Bunyan Meeting*, facsimile edn. with Introduction by G. B. Harrison (London, 1928). Bunyan's entries as pastor from 1672 onwards begin at f. 53 and continue on ff. 54, 55, 67, 69–72, 260. On the signatures see Joyce Godber, 'John Bunyan's Signature', *The Bedfordshire Magazine*, vi (1957), 47–49.

² See D.N.B.

1770.¹ The Gurneys may, of course, have relied on a family tradition handed down to her, but as one professionally concerned with handwriting Thomas may well have formed his own opinion; this assumes that he had seen an authenticated specimen on which an opinion might be based. But it is not at all impossible that he might have possessed such knowledge: he had grown up in the Bedford neighbourhood and numbered among his friends and relations members of the separatist church to which Bunyan had belonged; in 1730 he had married Martha Marsom, the daughter of Thomas Marsom, a fellow-prisoner of Bunyan's in the county jail.²

It is remarkable that John Brown, writing in 1885, was able to conjecture accurately that the aged Hannah Bunyan must have been the intermediary who preserved the manuscript for publication. But he does not seem to have seen the letter in the *Evangelical Magazine* since he attributes the office of agent between family and printer to Samuel Palmer:

It is probable that we are indebted to Samuel Palmer, the author of the *Nonconformist Memorial*, for its preservation. His family at that time lived in Bedford, his native town, where he was a frequent visitor during his ministry at Hackney, and this 'Relation' of Bunyan's imprisonment was published by James Buckland, at the Buck in Paternoster Row, who was also Palmer's publisher. (p. 429)

Gurney's letter shows that the manuscript was a fair copy prepared as if for publication. Charles Doe, Bunyan's first editor, had catalogued *A Relation* in *The Struggler*, his prospectus for the collected edition of 1692; it appears as the sixtieth of the 'sixty pieces of his labours' enumerated, and is described as *An Account of his Imprisonment*.³ Publication must have been intended, but the work does not appear in the Folio, though Doe printed twelve hitherto unpublished treatises from manuscript. It is known that copyright difficulties over the works already published prevented Doe from completing his edition in a second volume;⁴ although *A Relation* would present no such difficulty, he may have felt that its natural place was with *Grace Abounding* and therefore have held it over until he could establish his right to print the autobiography. Certainly once it had been published it became increasingly frequent for editors of *Grace Abounding* to add *A Relation* as a tail-piece, as for example George Offor did.

When the work itself is examined, however, it can be seen that it is not a unified narration. Instead it is simply five reports in the first person, each coming to a definite conclusion like a personal letter. The first report tells

¹ John Brown, *John Bunyan, His Life, Times and Work*, revd. F. M. Harrison (1928), pp. 245, 389-90, and family pedigree at p. 21.

² *D.N.B.* under Thomas Gurney; Brown, *Bunyan*, p. 492.

³ *The Struggler* (1691) in George Offor, *Works of Bunyan* (1860-2), iii. 793.

⁴ F. M. Harrison, *A Bibliography of the Works of John Bunyan* (Oxford, 1932), p. 66.

the story of his arrest and concludes thus:

Thus have I, in short, declared the manner and occasion of my being in prison; where I lie waiting the good will of God, to do with me as he pleaseth; knowing that not one hair of my head can fall to the ground without the will of my Father which is in Heaven. Let the rage and malice of men be never so great, they can do no more, nor go no further, than God permits them; but when they have done their worst, we know that all things work together for good to them that love God.

Farewell.

We may infer from this, and particularly from the phrase, 'where I lie waiting the good will of God', that this report was written very soon or immediately after the events it describes and before the other reports, in fact before Bunyan had decided to continue his account at all. Even the explanatory opening sentence of the work seems only to introduce the first report and not to be a collective introduction to the whole *Relation*:

The Relation of my Imprisonment in the Month of November 1660. When, by the good hand of my God, I had for five or six years together, without any great interruption, freely preached the blessed Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, . . . at the last I was laid out for by the warrant of a justice, and was taken and committed to prison. The relation thereof is as followeth:

The first sentence may be a title moved into the body of the text by the printer of 1765; whether it is or not, the dating by the month of his imprisonment, not his arrest, shows that it was still November when Bunyan composed this first report. It would be a curious form of words to choose if he was writing after March 1662, the time of the latest events described in the fifth section.

The other four reports have titles as follows:

Here is the Sum of my Examination before Justice Keelin, Justice Chester, Justice Blundale, Justice Beecher, and Justice Snagg, &c.

The Substance of some Discourse had between the Clerk of the Peace and myself, when he came to admonish me, according to the tenor of the Law by which I was in Prison.

Here followeth a discourse between my Wife and the Judges, with others, touching my Deliverance at the Assizes following; the which I took from her own Mouth.

Some Carriages of the Adversaries of God's Truth with me at the next Assizes, which was on the 19th of the First Month,¹ 1662.

The second report has a concluding paragraph similar to that of the first: 'Thus have I given you the substance of my examination. The Lord make these profitable to all that shall read or hear them. Farewell.' We should

¹ It is noteworthy that Bunyan uses the same chronology as the early Quakers.

not expect 'read or hear' of a printed work in the late seventeenth century; and the form 'these' seems more appropriate to manuscript correspondence, as does the reiterated 'Farewell'. I should infer a letter or report sent from prison to the Bedford congregation in order to strengthen and encourage them. The sparse entries in the *Church Book* at this period speak of a falling off in attendance at meetings and indicate a degree of panic. The letter might either be circulated among individuals or read aloud at the monthly meeting and at the meetings of the affiliated churches.¹

The third report is signed 'Farewell. J. B.' The fourth breaks off abruptly; no conclusion is appended to the verbatim report of Elizabeth Bunyan's conversation. The fifth is signed 'Farewell. JOHN BUNYAN.' Then there is a 'FINIS' which I suspect to be editorial.

As for the reports themselves, the details of direct speech are so full and so authentic that it would not seem possible for Bunyan to have written any of them very long after the incidents he is remembering. The admirable concreteness of the reporting gives *A Relation* its special flavour; it is also another argument in favour of the view that these were letters written to the congregation after each crucial stage in his imprisonment, that is, after each opportunity for obtaining release had passed by. It will suffice to quote the account of Bunyan's meeting soon after arrest with the Archdeacon's apparitor Foster, with its striking visual detail:

Well, when I came to the justice again there was Mr. *Foster* of Bedford, who coming out of another room and seeing me by the light of the candle, (for it was dark night when I went thither) he said unto me, Who is there? *John Bunyan?* with such seeming affection as if he would have leaped in my neck and kissed me. . . .

This theory of the origin of the imprisonment narrative would also explain the discrepancy between its account and that given in the concluding sections of *Grace Abounding*. If Bunyan believed in the early months of confinement, as he says in the latter work, that his imprisonment might end at the gallows, it is certain that he would keep silence about his apprehensions when exhorting a harried congregation at the beginning of an era of persecution when backsliding was a constant temptation to all but the

¹ *Church Book*, ff. 25-26. Bunyan's confinement was less stringent after the Assizes in August 1661: 'I had, by my Jailor, some liberty granted me, more than at first, and . . . I followed my wonted course of preaching, taking all occasions . . . to visit the people of God' (*A Relation*, ed. Brown (Cambridge, 1907), p. 131). This is confirmed by entries in the *Church Book* recording his admonitory visits to absentees from the monthly meeting on 28 Aug. and 26 Sept. ('We desire brother Bunyan and John Fenne to go again to sister Pecock', f. 24). But the first four reports cover a period when the *Church Book* speaks of 'our meetings having bene for some time neglected through the increase of trouble' and when he was presumably kept a close prisoner. The faithful few continued to meet, though less regularly.

boldest. With an eye all the time on the pastoral intention Bunyan was ready to advertise his heroic witness for the truth; but his greatest courage was shown in overcoming a mistaken fear of execution and being ready to 'make a scrabbling shift to go up the ladder': this he could not advertise for it would have been bad for morale had others too begun to suspect that the death penalty might be invoked against preachers to conventicles.¹

It is not so easy to explain why Bunyan kept a fair copy of his letters, the copy which came into the possession of his great-granddaughter. But once the difficulty of accounting for the separate existence of *A Relation* has been removed, there is no reason why that existence should not have been perpetuated. His conversion apart, it was the most memorable passage in all Bunyan's life, and worth recording with all that documentary care which the Puritans lavished on the evidences of Providence in relation to their own development. And if Bunyan had even considered publishing the five reports together as a further and more extensive witness to the truth, it is not surprising that no bookseller would look at them. The immediacy of the narrative and the author's burning sense of righteousness have not spared the enemies of truth. A reference to an important Bedford personality, 'in comes an old enemy to the truth, Dr. Lindale', could never have been set up. Fox in his *Journal* says some pretty plain things about his adversaries, but it was thirty to forty years after the events described. It is not that Bunyan attacks all the time, but that he records without missing a significant detail of outward behaviour; when his wife is before the judges, the unsympathetic Twisden and Chester are exposed by word and action:

He preach the word of God! said *Twisden*; (and withal she thought he would have struck her) . . .

At which *Chester* again seemed to be in a chafe, and put off his hat, and as she thought, scratched his head for anger.

It would be difficult to obtain a licence for a work of this character between 1660 and 1666, and after that, since Bunyan had summarized his prison experience in *Grace Abounding*, the work had no further function to perform.

It is thus possible, by practising an elementary mode of form-criticism, to estimate just what sort of a work *A Relation of the Imprisonment of Mr. John Bunyan* was, what was its pastoral function, and in what relation it stands to *Grace Abounding*.

¹ Under the statute of 35 Eliz., cap. i, according to which Bunyan was prosecuted, attendance at a conventicle could only be punished by death if the offender, having been transported for a third offence, escaped or returned from transportation; in that case he was condemned as a felon. But no Nonconformists suffered under this technicality, though the Act was re-enacted Chas. II, cap. iv. For the actual penalties of the time see Gerald R. Cragg, *Puritanism in the Period of the Great Persecution* (Cambridge, 1957), pp. 50-51.

DR. BURNEY'S MEMOIRS

By MIRIAM BENKOVITZ

AN examination of the manuscript remnants of Dr. Charles Burney's autobiography makes clear the fact that Mme d'Arblay's—Fanny Burney's—memoirs of her father create an unjust and untruthful impression of Dr. Burney.¹ No biographer with a full sense of responsibility can ignore or corrupt the recollections of his subject even when they are plainly illusory. Those happenings which a man holds in remembrance for as long as forty years are surely clues to the 'mystery and wilderness' of his existence. When he goes beyond mere recollection and sets them down as autobiography, they are immediately involved in the writer's self-evaluation. Not only do they associate him with some kind of environment, but they also assume, at least in part, the burden of characterization. Yet when Mme d'Arblay prepared the misnamed *Memoirs of Dr. Burney* she chose to pervert or to eliminate nearly all the material her father had recorded as autobiography.

Even a superficial reading of the *Memoirs* shows that the book is not one of Fanny's more successful writings. Too much has already been said, and in too many quarters, about the constantly increasing ostentation of her language and its bizarre arrangement. That Mme d'Arblay was guilty of

¹ British Museum Add. MS. 48345. Although there are fragments of Dr. Burney's memoirs in the Berg Collection of the New York Public Library and the private collection of Mr. James Osborn, Yale University, the present essay has made use only of the part of Dr. Burney's memoirs in the British Museum. The collection consists of mere fragments and scraps that with two exceptions are in Dr. Burney's hand. The two exceptions are in Mme d'Arblay's hand and very likely represent pages from the rough draft of the *Memoirs of Dr. Burney* (3 vols., London, 1832); these are not considered here. The material that Dr. Burney wrote about his early life is on the upper half of sheets from which the lower part has been torn away; that part is missing. Undamaged sheets, mostly folio, include a rough draft of a letter dated 24 Oct. 1797 from Chelsea to an unnamed correspondent and containing a list of Burney's musical works; a third-person holograph account of Dr. Burney's father and grandfather identical with the one printed in the *Memoirs*, i. x ff.; a brief catalogue of social activities in the final months of 1802 and a much fuller account of his social life in 1803; and two holograph letters (the second is a rough draft) to Miss Louisa Harris dated 20 Nov. 1808 and Jan. 1809. There is also a part of a small notebook, perhaps 6 inches by 4, that opens from bottom to top. The pages are numbered at the front top of each page, 23 to 37, making a total, front and back, of thirty pages. These contain quotations in French and English as well as *précis* of unidentified pieces and various observations and comments. On the back of p. 36 is written, 'Mem^{dum}. All the preceding extracts in this common-place book were made at Lynn Regis Norfolk between the y^r 1775 & 1760.' Inserted is a smaller, loose sheet numbered 38 on which is written, 'Opinions pro & Con: relative to this Question "Whether the Ancients Had any Knowledge of Harmony, or Music in Parts?"' Excerpts from unnamed sources and comments in English, French, and Greek follow. It seems well to add that although the contents of those parts of Dr. Burney's memoirs in the Berg and Osborn Collections multiply the possible examples, they do not alter the conclusions presented here.

pompous, obese language in the *Memoirs* is unquestionable. Furthermore, the book fails to focus on Dr. Burney. That was not due to the author's incompetence. On the contrary, it was a part of her design, for Mme d'Arblay stated in the 'Preface' that she felt privileged as a biographer to enrich her 'plain recital of facts' by adding anecdotes remembered since childhood. She said that while nothing was included that did not belong to Dr. Burney's 'history', the incidents were not 'always rigidly confined to his presence' if letters or diaries or her memory could supply characteristic accounts of notable people. What is more, her accuracy in the use of these materials may be doubtful; J. N. Croker, when he reviewed the *Memoirs* in *The Quarterly Review* for April 1833, thought so. In any case, Mme d'Arblay had too prominent a part in the incidents. She realized that she had, for she offered this excuse:

Not slight . . . is the embarrassment that struggles with the pleasure of these mingled reminiscences, from their appearance of personal obtrusion: yet, when it is seen that they are never brought forward but to introduce some incident or speech, that must else remain untold, of Dr. Johnson, Mr. Burke, Mrs. Delany, Mrs. Thrale, Mr. Bruce—nay, Napoleon—and some other high-standing names of recent date to the aged, yet of still living curiosity to the youthful reader—these apparent egotisms may be something more,—perhaps—than pardoned.

In other words the *Memoirs* alternates a biography of Dr. Burney with a discursive autobiography of Mme d'Arblay. But the fact that she disregarded her father's account makes inevitable the far more serious indictment of the book, the misrepresentation of Dr. Burney's character.

If Fanny had merely edited Dr. Burney's papers the question of fidelity in the treatment of her father's character could not have arisen. Certainly his record was complete and detailed enough for editing. The extent of the actual autobiography, or that of his early life at least, is apparent in the surviving fragments of the index which Dr. Burney made for his own memoirs. The index starts with an introduction on the first page and continues meticulously with details of Burney's ancestry, his childhood, his education, and his life to the age of thirty-eight in 1764, when he was in France for the purpose of putting two of his daughters, Hetty and Susan, to school. These scraps conclude with a journey back to Paris from Lyons indexed for page 147.¹ Mme d'Arblay chose, however, not to edit her father's record; instead she decided to prepare an 'abridged or recollected, not copied *Memoirs*'.

She carefully justified her decision. She wrote that in 1807, when Dr. Burney revived his plan, originated in 1782, for writing his memoirs, he had suffered a 'marked diminution of his resources for composition'. This had come about, she said, because Burney lived in constant dread of a

¹ Unless otherwise stated all references are to B.M. Add. MS. 48345.

recurrence of the paralytic stroke which had first afflicted him in 1806. The result of this fear, according to Fanny, was a 'spirit of composition' alive but 'enervated'. She added that thereafter

the whole force of his faculties was cast exclusively upon his memory, in the research of past incidents that might soothe his affection, or recreate his fancy; but bereft of those exhilarating ideas, which, previously to his alarm, had given attraction to whatever had fallen from his pen.

Hence arose, in the vast compilation for which, from this time, he began collecting materials and reminiscences, a nerveless laxity of expression, a monotonous prolixity of detail . . . (*Mem.*, iii. 382 f.)

Dr. Burney's account of his illness does not make it sound as serious as his daughter's did. In a letter written on 9 November 1806 to Edmond Malone, Burney spoke of a 'Torpor' in his left thumb as the only reminder of his 'paralytic affliction'. His concern about his condition seemed less grave, too, than his daughter indicated, for he added that '*in gloomy moments*' he could not help 'imagining that Damocles' sword' was suspended over his head.¹ Furthermore, Mme d'Arblay's phrases 'laxity of expression' and 'monotonous prolixity of detail' are hardly apt ones for the literary output of a man whose letters went easily and without self-consciousness from his 'old lady's airing in Hyde Park' to a 'curious old book of country dances, called *The Dancing Master*'. That was within a month or two after his illness. And within two years Burney was competent to set down tersely enough his recollection of certain prejudices of his friend Samuel Johnson, dead since 1784:

He wd not allow Prior any merit (who for a long time was the poetical idol of the nation) because he praised King Will^m & kept a wench—or Swift, though a Tory, because he wrote the *Tale of a Tub*. And he was very severe on Gray & Mason, not for being bad poets, but because they were members of the University of Cambridge—. . .²

Nevertheless, Mme d'Arblay insisted that the part of Dr. Burney's memoirs written immediately after 1808 was deficient in vitality. And she thought it imperative to curtail her father's account of himself and to rely instead on letters, journals, and her own 'whole life's recollections' of the progress, opinions, and personal qualities of Dr. Burney. She did so with the firm statement that every word written from her recollections was exact and that the alteration of her father's papers was in the interest of truth. 'Fact', she wrote, 'will as essentially be the basis of every article as if its object were still lent to earth and now listening to this exposition of his posthumous memoirs. . . .'³

¹ Bodley MS. Malone 38. The italics are mine.

² Charles Burney, ALS to Edmond Malone, Chelsea College, 9 Nov. 1806 and 11 June 1808. Bodley MS. Malone 38.

³ *Mem.*, i. vii. Cf. the statement of Mme d'Arblay's niece Charlotte Francis Barrett,

But Fanny's notion of fact where Dr. Burney was concerned had all the gloss and lustre that her real devotion to her father, as well as the sentimental ideal of what her devotion ought to be, could give it. The lines which she placed on the title-page of the *Memoirs*, lines first written with some variation for *Evelina* in 1777, suggest her limited perspective:

O could my feeble powers thy virtues trace,
By filial love each fear would be suppress'd;
The blush of incapacity I'd chace,
And stand—Recorder of thy worth!—confess'd.

Her material, then, was evaluated wholly by one criterion. As long as it praised or elevated Dr. Burney it was fact.

Unfortunately such an attitude in biography is limiting. It does not admit the insignificant, the contradictory, the whole mysterious complexity of human character. And in the *Memoirs* it ignores the excitement and the continuity of zest and energy that sustained Burney in his shabby existence on the outskirts of the English musical and theatrical world until he could satisfy his own vision of the adventure of life inseparable from the adventures of the intellect. It ignores on the one hand his urbanity, his capacity as a showman which he brought even to his own musical evenings at the house in St. Martin's Street, and it ignores on the other hand his stiff morality and his lack of wisdom where his children, and especially his daughters, were concerned. It disregards his provincial caution in matters of money. And it slights his iridescent interests, his ardent enthusiasm for a confusion of books and papers and people. It neglects the restless vigour that kept him alert and talkative at the end of a long day when, usually at eleven, the Burney family with any guests invited to remain sat down to supper, an excuse, as Fanny said, 'for chatting over baked apples'. Instead Mme d'Arblay's concept of biography produced a smooth, impenetrable façade without the dimensions of human intricacy. And whatever her own opinion, she succeeded only in making her father seem a pedant, a prig, and a snob.

This she did in the first place, so far as she made use of her father's recollections and so far as the few extant scraps allow that use to be judged, through distorting incidents recorded by her father. Here are two crucial examples. The fragment of Burney's account begins in the middle of a sentence:

... I liked were Prior's, w^{ch} I borrowed, and not being rich enough to purchase, I transcribed. And from a borrowed Shakespear, I made extracts of such passages as I was most delighted wth long before the beauties of Shakespeare were published.

editor of the *Diary and Letters*, that Mme d'Arblay was 'a model of truthfulness'. This was quoted in a letter written by another niece, Sarah Burney Payne, in Aug. 1860. The letter is in my possession.

In the height of summer I robbed my sleep of a few hours in order to meet some other boys at a Bowling-green: and used to tie a string to one of my great toes, w^{ch} I put out at the window of my room, by w^{ch} I was waked as soon as it was light, by an apprentice at next door.

In the *Memoirs* this became:

... the ardour of young Burney for improvement was such as to absorb his whole being; and his fear lest a moment of daylight should be profitless, led him to bespeak a labouring boy, who rose with the sun, to awaken him regularly with its dawn. Yet, as he durst not pursue his education at the expense of the repose of his family, he hit upon the ingenious device of tying one end of a ball of pack-thread round his great toe, and then letting the ball drop, with the other end just within the boy's reach, from an aperture in the old fashioned casement of his bed-chamber window.

This was no contrivance to dally with his diligence; he could not choose but rise. (i. 10)

The second example, concerned with Burney's marriage in 1748 to Esther Sleeppe, offers an even sharper contrast in the two narratives. His papers read:

Neither I nor my lovely sweet-heart met with opposition to our union, as there was no Fortune on either side; we only waited for Mr. Grevilles consent, as I thought myself accountable to him for my conduct as well as my time.¹ But having talked to him of my attachment to Miss Sleeppe & described her person & manners, I, at length, shewed him and M^{rs} Greville a picture of the sweet girl in miniature, painted by Spencer M^r Greville was so struck with her beauty that without my hinting a wish to complete our union till the full time of my apprenticeship was expired, he cried out, 'why don't you marry her Burney?'—when I eagerly said—'may I?'—We now lost no time; (the marriage act was not then even in contemplation) but the next day had the Gordian knot tied at May-Fair, where a Hymeneal priest had always, as in the Fleet, a parental witness ready to make a present of a bride.

Mme d'Arblay's version of the same incident, much abridged, reads:

... he took from his bosom the cherished miniature, and placed it fearfully, almost awfully, upon a table.

It was instantly and eagerly snatched from hand to hand by the gay couple; and young Burney had the unspeakable relief of perceiving that this impulsive trial was successful. . . .

As a statue he stood fixed before them; a smiling one, indeed; a happy one; but as breathless, as speechless, as motionless.

Mr. Greville then, with a laugh, exclaimed, 'But why, Burney, why don't you marry her?'

Whether this was uttered sportively, inadvertently, or seriously, young Burney

¹ Fulke Greville had paid Arne £300 for Burney's articles, probably in 1746.

took neither time nor reflection to weigh; but, starting forward with ingenious transport, called out, 'May I?' . . .

From this period, to that of their exquisitely happy union

'Gallop'd apace the fiery-footed steeds,'

that urged on time with as much gay delight as prancing rapidity. . . .

Little formality was requisite, before the passing of the marriage act, for presenting at the hymeneal altar its destined votaries; and contracts the most sacred could be rendered indissoluble almost at the very moment of their projection. . . . (i. 76 ff.)

Mme d'Arblay's further attempt to misrepresent her father, and more specifically to conceal the social order to which he belonged all his life, is apparent in her omission from the *Memoirs* of numerous incidents in her father's record. The record of his early life set Burney in a social level and in the profession of musician; the interests of the professional musician permeated almost everything he wrote. He gave an account of the great fire in Cornhill in which 'at least 200 houses were destroyed', but not without adding that among them was 'The Swan Tavern where the famous concert had been held, under the direction of Stanley, the celebrated blind Organist'. Even the confusion that resulted in 'all London and a considerable part of the nation' when the rebellion of 1745 broke out, Burney described hastily, squeezing it between his narrative of musical and theatrical affairs. But his daughter transformed him from a professional to a fashionable dilettante by all but ignoring the musical and theatrical connexions that he had from earliest boyhood.

One youthful incident, omitted from the *Memoirs*, Burney set down with disregard of chronology and conscious literary intent as a 'story of the Bear and Fiddle before that in Hudibras'. It tells about an incident that befell him as he went one day for his violin lesson:

Being ashamed to carry my fiddle through the streets in an ostensible manner, I cut a slit in the lining of my coat, and carried it unperceived. But in passing . . . on a market day, during that time when a poor bear was at the stake, and a great crowd of spectators assembled, I c^d not help stopping to see how the bear defended himself; when Ursa Major, breaking loose, put the mob to flight in such a panic, that they tumbled over each other, and over me among the rest; when smash went my instrument into shivers!

Another anecdote which Mme d'Arblay deleted does not emphasize Burney's theatrical life, but it does identify him with London's world of entertainment. It is the story of a practical joke that he played on his brother Richard. When Charles, aged eighteen and recently apprenticed to the musician Arne, first went to London in 1744, the two brothers were almost wholly unknown to each other. They had lived apart as children

and as young men—Richard had been in London for six years—so that neither was even familiar with the other's appearance. In his autobiography, Charles Burney told how he presented himself to Richard 'in the character of his Charles's particular friend, a Mr. Arnold' with a letter asking Richard to 'shew this friend the humours of London'. Richard complied, initiating the supposed Arnold into the pleasures of the city and even securing a dinner invitation for him from their half-brother Thomas Burney, whom Richard assisted in a dancing school. Young Charles, posing as Arnold, evaded the invitation, since Thomas did know him, and continued the deception for more than a month. Then one day, when Richard went to visit Charles at his residence with Arne in Queen Street, instead of asking for the 'young gentleman from Chester' as was his custom, Richard inquired for Mr. Arnold. The autobiographical account goes on,

M^r Arnold, says the maid, there is no one of that name here. No! says my brother; why what is the name of the young gentleman who came up to town wth M^r Arne from Chester? Oh that's Master Charles Burney. . . .

My brother was in a great rage with me for the imposition, and with himself for being the dupe of such a bare faced deception. . . .

More to the point, Mme d'Arblay omitted completely boyhood reminiscences so dear to Dr. Burney that, in one way or another, he referred to them in most of the things he wrote as well as in his autobiography; that is, the theatrical and musical life of Chester. Nowhere in the *Memoirs* did Mme d'Arblay even mention Whiteman, first violin player of Chester; Harry Alcock, who was the next 'first fiddle'; or the state composer and master of Dublin's band, Matthew Dubourg, whom young Burney heard play in Chester. She gave no account of the 'great hall of the Blue-coat Hospital which was fitted up for an Opera-house' at Chester. Nor did she tell about the production there of the 'serious opera of Amelia' with J. F. Lampe's setting of the drama written by Harry Carey. Carey's song 'Young Roger came tapping at Dolley's window' is the one the comedian Edward Shuter, then a foot-boy to Lampe and his wife, sang in imitation of a member of Lampe's troupe, Jemmy Worsdale. Worsdale, the portrait painter and dramatist, was a strolling actor in his youth. Burney recalled how Shuter 'contrived to mount the stage in the absence of Worsdale, and took him off so exactly, that he received even more applause than Worsdale himself, for which he would have been horse-whipped had the painter caught him'.

Furthermore Mme d'Arblay made short work of Dr. Burney's theatrical connexions during his first stay in London. Beyond the statement that 'the young musician had the advantage of setting to music a part of the mask of

Alfred' and that this brought him into a friendship with the poet James Thomson, she said nothing about Burney's participation during 1745 in the alteration of *The Masque of Alfred* from a spectacle of two acts 'to a regular tragedy of five acts, with incidental songs, duets and chorus'. David Mallet, Thomson's friend, enlarged the book and Charles Burney wrote new music for it. According to Burney's papers, Mallet wanted the words of all the songs adapted to old Scotch tunes. Burney 'indulged him in two or three; but as Alfred was not a scotsman', he decided it would be ridiculous 'to confine all the Songs to scotish melody', and so Burney, as he said, 'New set' all the rest except *Rule Britannia*.¹ Mme d'Arblay disregarded the fact that, also in 1745, by means of a letter from Arne to Handel, Burney was 'admitted' to Handel's oratorio band to play the tenor, and he attended rehearsals both at Handel's home in Brook Street and at Carlton House. She said little about Dr. Arne's connexion and, because Charles Burney was apprenticed to Arne, Burney's connexion with Drury Lane Theatre. There Arne was engaged as 'composer of Songs, Dances and Act tunes at a salary of £3 a week', and his apprentice served as a 'supernumerary Violin or Tenor' in pantomimes and musical pieces, off-stage serenades, processions, and 'other musical purposes, for stage effect'. And Fanny did not so much as name the performers with whom her father was associated. Among them were Burger, the harpsichord player with the 'very neat finger that never failed him in the common passages of w^{ch} his concerto were composed'; Cervetto, the Venetian and 'worthy Hebrew to whom the galleries had given the cognomen of Nosey'; Hebden, the Yorkshire man who played bassoon and violoncello; and Bennet, a tenor player and occasionally 'chorus singer and figurante in processions' who had once been a student of the prominent and learned Dr. Pepusch. Nor was mention made of Thomas Lowe, who, with Mrs. Arne, performed songs from Shakespeare's plays set by Arne as well as from *Comus*, *The Masque of Alfred*, and *The Blind Beggar of Bethnal Green*. Nowhere did Mme d'Arblay refer to 'young Vernon', whom Burney described as the 'best chorister in any of the three Cathedrals'; his teacher William Savage; the singers who took part in the 1745 production of *The Masque of Alfred*, Miss Nance and John Beard, first Handelian tenor and the second English tenor; the beautiful and licentious George Ann Bellamy, actress; and the host of others who walked the Drury Lane stage.

Mme d'Arblay also reduced sharply the details of Burney's professional activities after her father's articles with Arne were cancelled, whereas Burney recounted his affairs fully. He told with many particulars how he

¹ Cf. *Mem.*, i. 16; Percy A. Scholes, *The Great Dr. Burney* (London, 1948), i. 24 f. As Scholes states, the announcement of the performance (*General Advertiser*, 20 Mar. 1745) credits Dr. Arne with the music.

benefited from the patronage of the Reverend Mr. Home, afterwards Earl of Home, who had 'not only a passion for music, but played well on the violin'. He was, according to Burney's statement, 'exceedingly partial' to Burney's early attempts at composition. In late 1747 Home took Burney to Lady Townshend's residence to perform his setting for Thomson's *Ode on Aeolus's Harp* the first time. Home also made Burney known to 'The Scotch Orpheus' James Oswald, a celebrated performer of old Scotch tunes on the violoncello and a prolific composer. The friendship that followed proved most advantageous to Burney. Oswald kept a music shop on the 'pavement of St. Martin's church-yard', and from that shop issued the earliest ballads that Burney printed. At a later time Burney briefly gave up his teaching to work in the shop. And through his association with Oswald in the Society of the Temple of Apollo came an opportunity to write the music for the pantomime *Queen Mab*.¹

The Society of the Temple of Apollo was an organization of musicians, both professional and amateur—'dilettanti members' Charles Burney called them. Certainly Home was a member of the society and a very active one, but Oswald was its leader. He secured a patent for the 'sole publication of all Music composed, or pretended to be composed' by the members of the Society. Under this patent, Oswald published his own compositions and the music that Burney wrote for Drury Lane as well as his cantata and six songs.² Then Oswald persuaded Garrick that the members of the Society were gentlemen of 'taste and talents', and that some of them had much 'original genius, & w^d compose for the stage any pantomime entertainment, musical Farce, or even incidental songs in serious drama'. And they would do all this without any thought of payment for their compositions.

Thus it was to Oswald that the Drury Lane actor Henry Woodward went to ask the Society of the Temple of Apollo to set the songs for *Queen Mab*. Woodward delivered to Oswald 'in writing, subjects for the tunes that were to paint the several scenes and events of the piece; in which Puck the Fairy had several songs that were written by Garrick'. Oswald, in turn, delivered the libretto to Charles Burney, and he composed *The Comic Tunes in Queen Mab*. These were first performed at Drury Lane on 13 December 1750 and printed that same year for James Oswald as composed by the Society of the Temple of Apollo.

Most of these events happened before Burney's marriage. But his daughter was no more careful with later occurrences. One incident which

¹ Cf. Scholes, *Dr. Burney*, i. 55 f., where Mme d'Arblay's statement (*Mem.*, i. 20) that Burney composed the music for *Queen Mab* is left open to question.

² The title-page for this publication of 1750 reads, *Six Songs Composed for the Temple of Apollo. To which is added, a favourite cantata set to musick by Mr. Chas. Burney, Opera II, Lib. I. London, printed for and sold by J. Oswald at his musick shop in St. Martin's Church-yard in the Strand*. Cf. Scholes, *Dr. Burney*, ii. 342.

she ignored Burney had written down with evident amusement. Overwork in the early years of his marriage ended in a serious illness, so that his physician Dr. Armstrong ordered a change of air and complete rest. The patient was therefore removed to Canonbury House, which Dr. Burney described as an old palace once used occasionally as a residence for Queen Elizabeth but in his time converted partly for rental to the bookseller Newbery and partly for the use of lodgers and convalescents. Burney told how he was taken there in a litter: 'In my passage thither', he wrote, 'when- ever the chairmen stopt to rest me, and themselves, I had the exhilarating comfort of hearing passersby say "Ha! poor Soul! he's going to his long home!"'

In point of time that part of his record under consideration here almost ends with the Canonbury House incident. Except for meagre statements about the years 1802 and 1803, no autobiographical material exists from the date of his settling at King's Lynn at the close of 1751, just after his illness. Parts of journals for the last months of 1802 and 1803 survive. But the story of 1802 in the *Memoirs* has no connexion with Burney's brief remarks. These begin with the date 2 September, when, Burney said, he was at Richmond for three days; from there he went to Bulstrode, the seat of the Duke of Portland, near Beaconsfield, for a stay of more than two weeks. At Bulstrode he passed his time with Lord Edward, Lord Charles, and Lady Mary Bentinck; Lord Charles and Lady Elizabeth Spencer and their son, the Hon. William Spencer; the Hon. Mr. Walpole, and Mr. and Mrs. Hussey. Then Burney related that after he went home to Chelsea he was busy with 'nothing but the usual engagem^{ts} and transactions' until 3 November. On that date he heard the first opera of the season, Nasolini's *Merope*, originally composed for Mrs. Elizabeth Billington while she was in Italy. Mrs. Billington had sung the leading role in a London mounting of *Merope* on the occasion of Brigitta Giorgi Banti's farewell appearance on 23 March 1802, but Gerbini appeared in the production that Burney heard. He declared the music beautiful, 'elegant, natural, and new. . .'. In mid-December he visited Burlington House to meet Mrs. Billington, the musical sensation of London; and a week later he dined with her as the Duke of Portland's guest, probably again at Burlington House. There the record of 1802 ends.

As for the account of 1803, possibly Mme d'Arblay was not aware of its existence. If she did know about it, her failure to depend on her father's record is particularly surprising. She joined her husband in France in 1802 and remained until 1812, so that after 1802, as she said in the *Memoirs*, she was unable to supply any 'further narrative of which the detail' was 'personal or reciprocal'. She might have been expected to rely wholly on her father's memoranda and letters thereafter. She said, however, that she

found only one short note for the year 1803, a statement about the introduction of Beethoven's piano compositions into England by a Miss Tate (*Mem.*, iii. 334). That record does not survive. Scraps in Dr. Burney's hand dated 1803 and larded with names and events do. Most of the events were social in nature, but there is a complaint about the destruction of Hamilton's printing house by fire in February 1803. Burney lost a few books, but he consoled himself with the fact that many more of his books, to the value of £9,000, had been removed to George Robinson's warehouse, even though they fared very little better there. When Robinson became a bankrupt, as Burney recollected, he had great difficulty in recovering his books, which had been so neglected by Robinson's warehouseman that several pages and all the plates were 'spoiled by damp and dirt, and rendered unfit for sale'.

The rest of the 1803 account told about Burney's friends and acquaintances and his views on them. He explained his reluctance to attend the Monday night 'Conversazioni' of a Mr. King, very likely Edward King, 'the prophet' whose *Morsels of Criticism* appeared in 1788 and *Signs of the Times* in 1798. These two books had led many readers to expect the end of the world at any moment. Apparently that very thing disturbed Dr. Burney, for he did not feel at ease with King and his 'singular opinions', on which Burney was 'afraid of touching'. In addition the distance of King's residence in Manchester Street from Burney's in Chelsea discouraged the elderly Burney from going often to the Monday night gatherings. He went much more frequently to dine with Archdeacon William Cox, the traveller and writer whom Mrs. Thrale had once called a 'Quality dangler'; or with Mrs. Crewe, the beautiful and charming daughter of Burney's old patron Fulke Greville. Dr. Burney named or characterized a number of others who invited him to dine or to visit: the Marquis of Thomond and his Marchioness, niece of Sir Joshua Reynolds; Mrs. Stonehewer, the Bishop of Durham and Mrs. Barrington, Sir George Beaumont, whom Burney called 'the best landscape painter perhaps in the Kingdom', and Lady Beaumont, whom he found pleasing in manner although her musical abilities, he said, were 'without great assistance from nature, either in ear or finger'. At the rough but generous Earl of Cardigan's, Burney renewed acquaintance with Colonel Dudley North, who more than forty years before had been a 'fiddling' companion. Then Burney mentioned some of those who visited him. Among them were Lord and Lady Spencer and Mr. and Mrs. Ironmonger. Mr. Ironmonger, a dissenter, was in Burney's opinion the 'most benevolent, sweet-blooded man of his sect' and Mrs. Ironmonger, 'one of the most perfect females' Burney had ever known.

Perhaps in this record and in that of 1802 there is some of the

'monotonous prolixity of detail' on which Mme d'Arblay remarked in the *Memoirs*. Nevertheless both narratives, even in their fragmentary state, represent materials that the conscientious biographer cannot discard. They are a part of Burney's life and his self-exposition, for they include, in James Boswell's words, a 'view of his mind' as well as his 'visible progress through the world'. They have to do with Dr. Burney as the *Memoirs* do not. Indeed, so blatant are Mme d'Arblay's omissions and distortions in the *Memoirs* that a comparison with Burney's holograph autobiography brings up at once the question of intention.

Closely related is the quality of style in the *Memoirs*, the extravagant piling of grandiloquence on bombast which far outdistances 'elegant variation'. It is tempting to regard this style as symptomatic of Mme d'Arblay's intention to misrepresent Dr. Burney's character. This question might be examined in the light of all she wrote or, if that is too sweeping, in relation to everything except the journals and letters after 1782, the year *Cecilia* appeared. In any event the conclusion can at best be no more than surmise.

Nor can there be any certainty why Mme d'Arblay presented her father exactly as she did. As a 'memorialist' she is a failure, and her *Memoirs* are reprehensible. Yet an awareness of her achievement as novelist and journalist elicits an apology. In 1828, when she began the *Memoirs*, Mme d'Arblay was seventy-six years old. She had outlived nearly every member of her immediate family. The society to which she belonged had scattered decades earlier, and the world in which she felt at ease had disappeared. Being a Burney no longer mattered as it once had in fashionable and intellectual London. Perhaps her father's papers with their wealth of memories seduced her into an attempt to recapture the lost splendour of the years with Mrs. Thrale and Dr. Johnson, David Garrick, Sir Joshua Reynolds, and Edmund Burke; even to renew the unhappy years at the court of George III and the hazardous ones in France, by 1828 softened by nostalgia and time.

SHELLEY AND LUCRETIUS

By PAUL TURNER

IN *The Classical Tradition* Gilbert Highet sums up the relationship between Shelley and Lucretius as follows: 'The epigraph of *Queen Mab* is from Lucretius: otherwise there is little trace of his influence in Shelley' (pp. 421-2). If true, this would be rather odd, considering how highly Shelley thought of Lucretius, and how much he studied him. Having made his first acquaintance with the *De Rerum Natura* at school, he reread it in 1810, 1816, 1819, and 1820. According to Medwin, he 'studied Lucretius deeply' and 'considered him the best of the Latin poets'.¹ In a letter of 6 July 1817 he wrote: 'I am well acquainted with Lucretius. . . . The 4th book is perhaps the finest. The whole of that passage about love is full of irresistible energy of language as well as the profoundest truth.'² In the Preface to *The Revolt of Islam* he described himself as 'following in the footsteps' of 'the wise and lofty-minded Lucretius', whose 'doctrines are yet the basis of our metaphysical knowledge, and whose eloquence has been the wonder of mankind'. Finally, in the *Defence of Poetry*, while regretting that Lucretius 'limed the wings of his swift spirit in the dregs of the sensible world', he called him 'in the highest sense, a creator'.

Such studies as Brailsford's *Shelley, Godwin and their Circle* (London, 1913), and Notopoulos's *The Platonism of Shelley* (Durham, N.C., 1949) have shown that Shelley's intellectual heroes were apt to leave clear traces of influence on his work, and there seems no reason why Lucretius should be an exception. In fact, a close examination of Shelley's poetry reveals any number of Lucretian echoes; in this article I shall confine myself to pointing out the more obvious examples.

In the Notes of *Queen Mab* the following lines are quoted:

Suave mari magno turbantibus aequora ventis
E terra magnum alterius spectare laborem;
Non quia vexari quemquam est iucunda voluptas,
Sed quibus ipse malis careas quia cernere suave est.
Suave etiam belli certamina magna tueri
Per campos instructa, tua sine parte pericli;
Sed nil dulcius est bene quam munita tenere
Edita doctrina sapientum templa serena,

¹ T. Medwin, *Revised Life of Shelley*, ed. H. M. Forman (London, 1913), p. 50.

² *Works*, ed. R. Ingpen and W. E. Peck (London, 1926), ix. 231.

Despicere unde queas alios, passimque videre
Errare atque viam palantis quaerere vitae;
Certare ingenio; contendere nobilitate
Noctes atque dies niti praestante labore
Ad summas emergere opes, rerumque potiri.
O miseras hominum mentes! O pectora caeca!

(D.R.N., ii. 1-14)

The theme of this passage, and the image of looking down serenely from a height at the stormy sea of human life, occur repeatedly in Shelley's poems. Early in *Queen Mab* we find:

The Spirit seemed to stand
High on an isolated pinnacle;
The flood of ages combating below. . . . (ii. 252-4)

The parallel becomes more exact in the rewriting of the passage for *The Daemon of the World*:

they did rage horribly,
Breathing in self-contempt fierce blasphemies
Against the Daemon of the World, and high
Hurling their armed hands where the pure Spirit,
Serene and inaccessibly secure,
Stood on an isolated pinnacle,
The flood of ages combating below. . . . (282-8)

The raging sea is now equated, as in Lucretius, with the struggles of mankind; the Spirit has become *pure*, a technical term in Lucretian doctrine ('at bene non poterat sine puro pectore vivi' (v. 18)), and acquired the epithets *serene* (*serena*) and *inaccessibly secure* (*bene munita*).

In *The Revolt of Islam* Laon and Cythna retire from the battle on the plain to 'a rocky hill which overhung the Ocean' (2533):

And we sate calmly, though that rocky hill
The waves contending in its caverns strook. . . . (2674-5)

After death they make their way over 'a wind-wrought sea' where 'the waves rolled like mountains' to a literal *templum serenum* above the waves, the Temple of the Spirit.

In *Prince Athanase* and *Rosalind and Helen* the Prince and Lionel are similarly elevated above the struggles of humanity:

he sate
Apart from men, as in a lonely tower,
Pitying the tumult of their dark estate.
(*Prince Athanase*, 32-34)

Secure as one on a rock-built tower
 O'er the wrecks which the surge trails to and fro,
 'Mid the passions wild of human kind
 He stood . . . (Rosalind and Helen, 632-5)

So, according to the priests in the Temple of Famine, is the royal house of Swellfoot:

Through thee the sacred SWELLFOOT dynasty
 Is based upon a rock amid that sea
 Whose waves are swine—so let it ever be!
 (Swellfoot the Tyrant, II. ii. 17-19)

And the sea of humanity makes its last appearance in *The Triumph of Life*, where it engulfs Rousseau:

but among
 The thickest billows of that living storm
 I plunged. (465-7)

Equally central to Lucretius' poem is the image of bringing light into the darkness of human error:

Hunc igitur terrorem animi tenebrasque necessest
 non radii solis neque lucida tela diei
 discutiant, sed naturae species ratioque.
 (i. 146-8, ii. 59-61, iii. 91-93)

E tenebris tantis tam clarum extollere lumen
 qui primus potuisti inlustrans commoda vitae. . . (iii. 1-2)

This second image is frequent in Shelley also. In *The Revolt of Islam* Cythna proposes to 'go forth alone, bearing the lamp aloft' (*extollere lumen*) which Laon has 'kindled in her heart' (1055-6). Laon thinks of those 'who sternly struggle to relume the lamp of Hope o'er man's bewildered lot' (1471-3), and himself rears 'that lamp of hope on high' (1554-5), while the Hermit's spirit has become 'a lamp of splendour' (1481-2). So in *Adonais* and the *Ode to Liberty*: 'A godlike mind soars forth' ('deus ille fuit, deus, inclute Memmi!' (*D.R.N.* v. 8)),

and when
 It sinks, the swarms that dimmed or shared its light
 Leave to its kindred lamps the spirit's awful night.
 (*Adonais*, 259-61)

Oh, that the wise from their bright minds would kindle
 Such lamps within the dome of this dim world,
 That the pale name of priest might shrink and dwindle. . . .
 (*Ode to Liberty*, 226-8)

At one point Lucretius combines the images of *sea* and *light*:

quique per artem
fluctibus e tantis vitam tantisque tenebris
in tam tranquillo et tam clara luce locavit. (v. 10-12)

Shelley frequently does so too, and by a natural transition of ideas the lamp tends to become a star over the sea, or a lighthouse:

O human Spirit! spur thee to the goal
Where virtue fixes universal peace,
And midst the ebb and flow of human things,
Show somewhat stable, somewhat certain still,
A lighthouse o'er the wild of dreary waves.
(*Queen Mab*, viii. 53-57)

thou and I
Sweet friend! can look from our tranquillity
Like lamps into the world's tempestuous night,—
Two tranquil stars, while clouds are passing by
Which wrap them from the foundering seaman's sight . . .
(*Revolt of Islam*, 121-5)

Laon's name to the tumultuous throng
Were like the star whose beams the waves compel. . . .
(*Ibid.*, 1563-4)

And the passage already quoted about Lionel has a similar conclusion:

As where the evening star may walk
Along the brink of the gloomy seas.
(*Rosalind and Helen*, 644-5)

When Athanase and Zonoras stay up late talking about philosophy, the light from their window becomes symbolic of the same idea:

and when winter's roar
Sounded o'er earth and sea its blast of war,
The Balearic fisher, driven from shore,
Hanging upon the peaked wave afar,
Then saw their lamp from Laian's turret gleam,
Piercing the stormy darkness, like a star
Which pours beyond the sea one steadfast beam. . . .
(*Prince Athanase*, 185-91)

But perhaps the most unmistakably Lucretian combination of these two images occurs in the *Sonnet to Wordsworth*:

Thou wert as a lone star, whose light did shine
On some frail bark in winter's midnight roar:
Thou hast like to a rock-built refuge stood
Above the blind and battling multitude. (7-10)

Here we have the additional echoes of *O pectora caeca!* and *certamina belli*.

Another favourite theme in Shelley's writings is the loss of wonder at the beauty of the world:

Nor had that scene of ampler majesty
Than gems or gold, the varying roof of heaven
And the green earth lost in his heart its claims
To love and wonder . . . (Alastor, 95-98)

Earth, our bright home, its mountains and its waters,
And the ethereal shapes which are suspended
Over its green expanse . . . none wandered forth
To see or feel . . . (Revolt of Islam, 703-9)

well might they learn

To gaze on this fair world with hopeless unconcern! (Ibid., 728-9)

Three times in the *Defence of Poetry* he returns to this idea. Poetry 'strips the veil of familiarity from the world, and lays bare its naked and sleeping beauty', 'it purges from our inward sight the film of familiarity which obscures from us the wonder of our being', 'it creates anew the universe'.¹ But it is in the fragment *On Life* that we find the closest parallel to the Lucretian source of this theme:

If any artist . . . had conceived in his mind the system of the sun, and the stars and the planets, they not existing, and had painted to us in words, or upon canvas, the spectacle now afforded by the nightly cope of heaven, great would be our admiration. . . . But now these things are looked on with little wonder. . . . The multitude of men care not for them.²

nil adeo magnum neque tam mirabile quicquam
quod non paulatim minuant mirari omnes.
principio caeli clarum purumque colorem,
quaeque in se cohibet, palantia sidera passim,
lunamque et solis praeclara luce nitorem;
omnia quae nunc si primum mortalibus essent,
ex improvise si sint obiecta repente,
quid magis his rebus poterat mirabile dici
aut minus ante quod auderent fore credere gentes?
nil, ut opinor: ita haec species miranda fuisset.
quam tibi iam nemo, fessus satiate videndi,
suspiciere in caeli dignatur lucida templa! (ii. 1028-39)

Even more frequent in Shelley's poetry is the thought that Hell is here rather than hereafter:

There needeth not the hell that bigots frame
To punish those who err: earth in itself
Contains at once the evil and the cure. (*Queen Mab*, iii. 79-81)

¹ *Shelley's Defence of Poetry*, ed. H. F. B. Brett-Smith (Oxford, 1937), pp. 33, 56.

² *Prose Works of Shelley*, ed. Reeves and Turner (London, 1880), ii. 258.

Earth was no longer Hell . . . (*Queen Mab*, viii. 14)

and Giacomo, I think, will find
Life a worse Hell than that beyond the grave.

(*Cenci*, iv. i. 47-48)

his death will be
But as a change of sin-chastising dreams,
A dark continuance of the Hell within him . . .

(*Ibid.*, iv. ii. 31-33)

Hell is a city much like London . . .

(*Peter Bell the Third*, 147 ff.)

this cold common hell, our life. . . .

(*Epipsychidion*, 214)

The simplest explanation for the recurrence of this notion is that Shelley read, at an impressionable age, the passage beginning:

Atque ea nimirum quaecumque Acherunte profundo
prodita sunt esse, in vita sunt omnia nobis.

(*D.R.N.*, iii. 978-9)

When, indeed, he describes the madhouse in *Julian and Maddalo* as 'this Hell' (260), he might almost seem to be giving a literal turn to the Lucretian epigram: 'Hic Acherusia fit stultorum denique vita' (iii. 1023).

Several more of his recurrent images seem to come from Lucretius. The 'door' or 'gate' of death, which appears in *Queen Mab* (v. 47-48), *Alastor* (211-13), and *The Revolt of Islam* (4114-15), sounds like a translation of 'ianua leti' (*D.R.N.*, v. 373). In the latter poem we find 'the daylight, cleaving, with arrowy beams the dark-red air' (310); in *Prince Athanase* (128) the Prince's eyes shine with 'arrowy light'; in *Epipsychidion* (168) Imagination 'kills Error with many a sun-like arrow'; in *To a Skylark* (21) the 'silver sphere' sends out 'keen arrows'; and in the *Hymn of Apollo* (13-14) the sun-god says: 'The sunbeams are my shafts, with which I kill deceit.' These arrows of light, which sometimes have the function of destroying error and deceit, are evidently derived from the thrice-repeated lines:

Hunc igitur terrorem animi tenebrasque necesest
non radii solis neque lucida tela diei
discutiant, sed naturae species ratioque.

(*D.R.N.*, i. 146-8; ii. 59-61; iii. 91-93)

Then there is the comparison of the heart to an oracular shrine:

that majestic theme
Shrined in her heart found utterance . . .

(*Revolt of Islam*, 338-9)

his gestures did obey
 The oracular mind that made his features glow,
 And where his curved lips half-open lay,
 Passion's divinest stream had made impetuous way.

(Ibid., 654-7)

So much I asked before, and my heart gave
 The response thou hast given; and of such truths
 Each to itself must be the oracle.

(*Prometheus Unbound*, II. iv. 121-3)

quamquam multa bene ac divinitus invenientes
 ex adyto tamquam cordis responsa dedere
 sanctius et multo certa ratione magis quam
 Pythia quae tripodi a Phoebi lauroque profatur . . .

(*D.R.N.*, i. 736-9)

Three times in *The Revolt of Islam* (476, 2396, 3486) the waves 'laugh' or 'smile'. The image is repeated in *Julian and Maddalo* (25) and *Letter to Maria Gisborne* (38), and doubtless derives from an association in Shelley's mind of the Aeschylean *ποντίων κυμάτων ἀνήριθμον γέλασμα* (*P.V.*, 89-90) with the Lucretian 'tibi rident aequora ponti' (i. 8) and 'ridentibus undis' (v. 1005).

Shelley was evidently fond of the thought that the earth throws a conical shadow:

I spin beneath my pyramid of night,
 Which points into the heavens dreaming delight . . .

(*P.U.*, iv. 444-5)

But She, whom prayers or tears then could not tame,
 Passed, like a God throned on a winged planet . . .
 Into the dreary cone of our life's shade. (*Epipsychidion*, 225-8)

But I, whom thoughts which must remain untold
 Had kept as wakeful as the stars that gem

The cone of night . . . (*Triumph of Life*, 21-23)

The first poetical use of the idea that Shelley is likely to have come across is in the *De Rerum Natura*:

et cur terra queat lunam spoliare vicissim
 lumine et oppressum solem super ipsa tenere,
 menstrua dum rigidas coni perlabitur umbras.

(v. 762-4)

To conclude this brief list of recurrent Lucretian echoes, there is the phrase 'daedal earth' (*daedala tellus* (i. 7)), which appears in *Mont Blanc* (86), *Ode to Liberty* (18), and the *Hymn of Pan* (26); while 'daedal gold', which occurs in a fragment of 1819, may be guessed to have come from a

combination of the 'cunningly-wrought statues' (*daedala signa*) of v. 1451, with the delightful golden statues described in an earlier passage:

si non aurea sunt iuvenum simulacra per aedes
lampadas igniferas manibus retinentia dextris,
lumina nocturnis epulis ut suppeditentur . . . (ii. 24-26)

I shall now go through the poems in chronological order, pointing out the more obvious traces of Lucretian influence.

Apart from the two quotations from Lucretius in the Notes, the epigraph of *Queen Mab*, taken in conjunction with the sub-title, 'A Philosophical Poem', implies that the whole work is consciously modelled on the *De Rerum Natura*, and the two poems closely resemble one another in character and purpose: both are anti-religious sermons on ethics, supported by quasi-scientific accounts of the physical universe and surveys of human evolution. And not only is Section III of *Queen Mab* a dramatization of the Epicurean argument that wealth and power do not bring peace of mind (cf. *D.R.N.*, ii. 1-61), but the picture of the unhappy king tossing feverishly on a gorgeous couch is taken straight from Lucretius:

Behold him now
Stretched on the gorgeous couch; his fevered brain
Reels dizzily awhile . . . (iii. 56-59)

nec calidae citius decedunt corpore febres,
textilibus si in picturis ostroque rubenti
iacteris, quam si in plebeia veste cubandum est. (ii. 34-36)

The poison-tree that appears three times in *Queen Mab* (iv. 82-89, v. 44-45, vi. 207) evidently comes from *D.R.N.*, vi. 786-7; and the use of the word *grandeur* in the following lines suggests that Shelley was thinking not so much of an English coal-mine as of the gold-mine in Lucretius:

and yon squalid form
Leaner than fleshless misery, that wastes
A sunless life in the unwholesome mine,
Drags out in labour a protracted death,
To glut their grandeur . . . (iii. 112-16)

quidve mali fit ut exhalent aurata metalla!
quas hominum reddunt facies qualisque colores!
nonne vides audisve perire in tempore parvo
quam soleant et quam vitai copia desit,
quos opere in tali cohibet vis magna necassis? (vi. 811-15)

After describing how much better the weather will be at the millennium,

and what improvements may be expected in the moral character of lions, Shelley goes on to say:

Like passion's fruit, the nightshade's tempting bane
Poisons no more the pleasure it bestows:
All bitterness is past; the cup of joy
Unmingled mantles to the goblet's brim,
And courts the thirsty lips it fled before.

(viii. 129-33)

The transition from vegetable poisons to 'the cup of joy' is a little puzzling, until one realizes that by punning on the literal and metaphorical connotations of 'passion's fruit' and 'nightshade' Shelley has passed from the realm of botany to that of sex. It is then clear that these lines contain an allusion, and an answer, to two of Lucretius' most famous statements in 'that passage about love':

nequiquam, quoniam medio de fonte leporum
surgit amari aliquid quod in ipsis floribus angat . . .

(iv. 1133-4)

ut bibere in somnis sitiens cum quaerit et umor
non datur, ardorem qui membris stingere possit,
sed laticum simulacra petit frustra laborat
in medioque sitit torrenti flumine potans,
sic in amore Venus simulacris ludit amantis. . . .

(iv. 1097-1101)

The hint for Shelley's botanical approach to the subject was already present in the phrase 'quod in ipsis floribus angat', which may also have connexions with another passage in which the nightshade is associated with sex, *flores*, and a *fons*:

There,—One, whose voice was venom'd melody
Sate by a well, under blue nightshade bowers;
The breath of her false mouth was like faint flowers,
Her touch was as electric poison. . . .

(*Epipsychidion*, 256-9)

Later in *Queen Mab* we find 'blue mists' floating 'through the atmosphere' and scattering 'the seeds of pestilence' (viii. 168-9). Lucretius had already spoken of 'semina morbi' collecting into a 'morbidus aer' and drifting through the sky 'ut nubes nebulaeque' (vi. 1090-1100): the *blue* was a picturesque detail contributed by Shelley. The last quotation from *Epipsychidion* possibly explains the choice of colour.

In *The Revolt of Islam* sufferers from the plague jump naked into wells (3973-81), and corpses are piled high 'near the great fountain in the public square' (3992). These details were clearly taken either from the description of the plague at Athens in Thucydides, Book ii, or from Lucretius' versification of the same passage in *D.R.N.*, vi. On general grounds it

seems more likely to have been the latter; and certainly when Shelley writes of the plague affecting flocks and herds (3921), he is in line with Lucretius (vi. 1092, 1127) rather than Thucydides, who merely says that birds and animals died if they ate human flesh (ii. 50).

To Constantia, Singing contains a free paraphrase of the famous passage about Epicurus:

The cope of heaven seems rent and cloven
By the enchantment of thy strain,
And on my shoulders wings are woven,
To follow its sublime career
Beyond the mighty moons that wane
Upon the verge of Nature's utmost sphere,
Till the world's shadowy walls are past and disappear. (14-20)

effringere ut arta
naturae primus portarum claustra cupiret.
ergo vivida vis animi pervicit, et extra
processit longe flammantia moenia mundi
atque omne immensum peragravit mente animoque
unde refert nobis victor . . . (i. 70-75)

The same passage may well have combined with memories of the *Somnium Scipionis* to suggest the space-travel in *Queen Mab*, and perhaps the following lines in *Adonais*:

Clasp with thy panting soul the pendulous Earth;
As from a centre, dart thy spirit's light
Beyond all worlds, until its spacious might
Sate the void circumference: then shrink
Even to a point within our day and night. . . . (417-21)

'Pendulous Earth' is reminiscent of 'aeris in spatio magnam pendere docentes tellurem' (ii. 602-3); and the *moenia mundi* reappear in *Hellas* as an 'out-wall, bastioned impregnably against the escape of boldest thoughts' (774-5).

Notopoulos has already pointed out two Lucretian echoes in *Prometheus Unbound*.¹ In addition there is the image of the stars as a flock of sheep pasturing in the sky (iv. 1-3, 419), which, like the idea of the Coursers being turned out to graze in the sun, and 'pasturing flowers of vegetable fire' (III. iv. 108-10) is probably derived from the following:

unde aether sidera pascit? (D.R.N., i. 231)
sive ipsi serpere possunt
quo cuiusque cibus vocat atque invitat euntis,
flammea per caelum pascentis corpora passim. (v. 523-5)

And the last word in Act III is the Lucretian technical term, *inane*.

¹ *The Platonism of Shelley*, pp. 256, 257.

In *The Cenci* Giacomo quotes a Lucretian catch-phrase, and questions the practical truth of the argument in which it occurs:

If you,
Cardinal Camillo, were reduced at once
From thrice-driven beds of down and delicate food,
An hundred servants and six palaces,
To that which *nature doth indeed require?* (II. ii. 12-16)

nonne videre
nil aliud sibi naturam latrare, nisi utqui
corpore seiunctus dolor absit, mente fruatur
iucundo sensu cura semota metuque?
ergo corpoream ad naturam pauca videmus
esse opus omnino, quae demant cumque dolorem,
delicias quoque uti multas substernere possint.
gratius interdum, neque *natura ipsa requirit* . . . (ii. 16-23)

In this passage, which comes immediately after that quoted in the Notes of *Queen Mab*, *delicias* and *substernere* evidently provided the suggestion for 'delicate food' and 'beds of down'.

Seeing pictures in the clouds is a common enough pastime, but seeing giants is rather more individual:

Till as clouds grow on the blast,
Like tower-crowned giants striding fast . . .
(*Masque of Anarchy*, 106-7)

ut nubis facile interdum conrescere in alto
cernimus et mundi speciem violare serenam
aera mulcentis motu. nam saepe Gigantum
ora volare videntur et umbram ducere late,
interdum magni montes avulsaque saxa
montibus anteire et solem succedere praeter,
inde alios trahere atque inducere belua nimbos.
(*D.R.N.*, iv. 136-42)

Clouds like *magni montes* also occur in *Hellas* (957-8) and *Evening: Ponte al Mare* (20-21).

The Witch of Atlas contains the curious zoological error that kittens are born without claws:

What, though no mice are caught by a young kitten,
May it not leap and play as grown cats do,
Till its claws come? (5-7)

Shelley was evidently relying on the authority of Lucretius (but overlooking the saving word *vix*):

at catuli pantherarum scymnique leonum
 unguibus ac pedibus iam tum morsuque repugnant,
 vix etiam cum sunt dentes unguisque creati. (v. 1036-8)

In the same poem Lucretius is responsible for another odd idea, that it is air, not love, that makes the world go round:

And sometimes to those streams of upper air
 Which whirl the earth in its diurnal round . . .
 (489-90; cf. *D.R.N.*, v. 510-23)

Finally the rather tasteless touch about the lovers who have intercourse with one another in their sleep, and think it was all a dream 'till the tenth moon shone' (656) was doubtless suggested by the passage (*D.R.N.*, iv. 1030-6) about 'certain phenomena connected with sleep' which is also paraphrased in *A Discourse on the Manners of the Ancient Greeks*.¹

Swellfoot the Tyrant contains three Lucretian parallels, though Shakespeare probably had a hand in the last one:

The future looks as black as death, a cloud
 Dark as the frown of Hell, hangs over it . . . (I. i. 96-97)

praeterea modo cum fuerit liquidissima caeli
 tempestas, perquam subito fit turbida foede,
 undique uti tenebras omnis Acherunta rearis
 liquisse et magnas caeli complesse cavernas,
 usque adeo taetra nimborum nocte coorta
 impendent atrae formidinis ora superne . . . (iv. 168-73)

What though Cretans old called thee
 City-crested Cybele? (II. ii. 3-4)

Hanc veteres Graium docti cecinere poetae . . .
 muralique caput summum cinxere corona,
 eximiis munita locis quia sustinet urbis . . . (ii. 600-7)

Nay, it might hide the blood, which the sad Genius
 Of the Green Isle has fixed, as by a spell,
 Upon my brow—which would stain all its seas,
 But which those seas could never wash away! (II. ii. 78-81)

purpureusque color conchyli iungitur una
 corpore cum lanae, dirimi qui non queat usquam,
 non si Neptuni fluctu renovare operam des,
 non, mare si totum velit eluere omnibus undis. (vi. 1074-7)

¹ See Notopoulos, p. 411.

Although the thought of *Epipsychidion* is largely Platonic, the key-phrases, 'this soul out of my soul' (238) and 'a soul within the soul' (455) do not appear to come from Plato. As early as 10 January 1812, long before Shelley developed his enthusiasm for Plato, he wrote: 'the sublime interest of poetry . . . the proselytism of the world . . . were to me soul of my soul'. The source of this phrase, and later variants of it, is probably the passage where Lucretius is defining the fourth ingredient in the soul, the vital principle which is neither heat, air, nor wind:

anima est animae proporro totius ipsa . . .

atque animae quasi totius ipsa

proporrost anima et dominatur corpore toto. (iii. 275, 280-1)

It is conceivable that the hint for writing a Lucretian-type philosophical poem round the figure of Queen Mab was given by the use of the word 'atomies' in Mercutio's speech ('drawn with a team of little atomies'). Certainly in the *Triumph of Life* this word implies an allusion to the passage in Lucretius (ii. 114-22) where the movements of atoms are compared to those of motes in a sunbeam:

the crew

Seemed in that light, like atomies to dance

Within a sunbeam.

(445-7)

Towards the end of this fragment the earth becomes 'grey with phantoms' and the air is 'peopled with dim forms' (481-3) which have been thrown off by individual human beings:

each one

Of that great crowd sent forth incessantly

These shadows, numerous as the dead leaves blown

In autumn evening from a poplar tree.

Each like himself and like each other were

At first; but some distorted seemed to be

Obscure clouds, moulded by the casual air;

And of this stuff the car's creative ray

Wrought all the busy phantoms that were there,

As the sun shapes the clouds; thus on the way

Mask after mask fell from the countenance

And form of all . . .

(526-37)

Again the thought is Platonic, but the image is Lucretian. It comes from Book iv ('the 4th book is perhaps the finest'), where sensation, thought, and dreams are explained on the principle that all physical objects are constantly sending off film-like *simulacra* or *figurae*, which float about in the air until they come in contact with a mind (iv. 46 ff.). As these *simulacra* are

extremely thin (*tenuis*), they sometimes become distorted in transit, just as clouds seem to change their shape, and look like giants, mountains, &c. (iv. 134-42); and these distorted *simulacra* are the causes of thoughts and dreams about things which have never really existed. Other imaginary concepts are produced by *simulacra* which develop spontaneously in the air (iv. 736). In this category Shelley apparently placed Ahasuerus, who is one of 'Fancy's *thin* creations' in *Queen Mab* (vii. 62-63):

The matter of which dreams are made
Not more endowed with actual life
Than this phantasmal portraiture
Of wandering human thought. (*Queen Mab*, vii. 272-5)

The word *matter* is used literally, for the *simulacra* are definitely material; and *wandering* translates the word *vagari* which Lucretius normally uses to describe the movements of *simulacra* (iv. 53, 127, 129).

I conclude with three general points. First, the anti-religious bias which runs through all Shelley's work can hardly be unconnected with his study of Lucretius. 'Tantum relligio potuit suadere malorum' is the motto of many episodes in his poems, and the Wandering Jews and the atheists burnt at the stake are obviously his equivalents for Iphigenia (*D.R.N.*, i. 80-101).

Secondly, it can scarcely be a coincidence that earthquakes, volcanoes, lightning, and clouds play such an important part in Shelley's imagery, and that Book vi of the *De Rerum Natura* is devoted to an account of these phenomena.

Finally, there is Shelley's well-known tendency to attribute a kind of solidity to the things of the mind. Thus visions can be packed away 'each in its thin sheath, like a chrysalis' (*Witch of Atlas*, 162): Greece is 'built on the crystalline sea of thought' (*Hellas*, 696-9), and we are given to understand that this represents an extremely firm foundation. Now, from one point of view this solidification of the mental may be regarded as a symptom of Shelley's idealism, his natural sympathy with the doctrines of Berkeley and Plato. But is it not also a stylistic habit caught from the early and frequent study of a poet for whom even the spoken word is a form of matter (hence the exhaustion of public speakers after a hard day's work! *D.R.N.*, iv. 535-41), and even thoughts and dreams are caused by material *simulacra* floating about in the air?

NOTES

SHAKESPEARE AMONG THE COMMONPLACES

SEVERAL scholars have suggested that Shakespeare made use of such compilations as the *Adagia* of Erasmus. In one stanza of *Lucrece* (855-61), as Professor T. W. Baldwin has shown,¹ there are echoes from Horace's first satire (69 ff.), quoted by Erasmus under the heading *avaritia*, and from the parable of the covetous man in St. Luke's Gospel (xii. 15-21), together with the marginal note in the Geneva version. The link between Horace's satire and the Bible is provided, as I have attempted to show elsewhere,² by a quotation from one of Horace's odes (iii. 16), cited also by Erasmus under the same heading.

The same method of composition can be observed in *Richard II*. In addition to Holinshed, Froissart, Daniel, and *Woodstock*, Shakespeare may have consulted some French manuscript sources,³ though the most recent editor of the play is sceptical of this.⁴ But a close examination of two set pieces in the play shows that Shakespeare combined hints from a number of other sources.

For the passage relating to Bolingbroke's banishment, the poet again had recourse to the *Adagia*.⁵ Under the heading *patria* he would have found Ovid's lines:

Omne solum forti patria est, ut piscibus aequor,
Ut volucris vacuo quicquid in orbe patet.

These had been adapted by Brooke in the poem which Shakespeare used about the same time for *Romeo and Juliet*:

Unto a valiant heart there is no banishment,
All countries are his native soil beneath the firmament.
As to the fish the sea, as to the fowl the air,
So is like pleasant to the wise each place of his repair.

This in *Richard II* becomes:

All places that the eye of heaven visits
Are to a wise man ports and happy havens.

¹ *On the Literary Genetics of Shakespeare's Poems and Sonnets* (Urbana, 1950), pp. 133-6.

² *Shakespeare's Sources* (London, 1957), i. 15.

³ e.g. Créton, and *La Traison*.

⁴ Peter Ure in the new Arden edition (1956).

⁵ Cf. T. W. Baldwin, *William Shakespeare's Small Latine and Lesse Greeke* (Urbana, 1944), ii. 427.

Solum, by a play upon words, probably suggested *sol*; and this appears as 'the eye of heaven', another Ovidian phrase, used also in the *Sonnets*.¹

Under *exilium*, Shakespeare would have found a reference to Cicero's *Tusculan Disputations*, v. There he could read, perhaps in Dolman's translation, a long discussion of exile as one of the worst of evils. Cicero says that if you count it a misery to be from your country, 'then truly is every province full of wretched men, of whom very few return home again'. He then refers to Teucer's saying, 'My country is wheresoever I live well.' In the same book is a passage which Steevens believed to lie behind Bolingbroke's speech, on the failure of the memory of past pleasures to ease our present griefs: 'As if a man well nigh parched with heat, so that he is no longer able to abide the sun, should comfort himself with the remembrance that once heretofore he had bathed himself in the cold rivers of Arpynas.' That Shakespeare did indeed know this passage is supported by the fact, to which Mr. J. C. Maxwell drew my attention, that Cicero goes on to ask:

What part of Barbary is there more wild or rude than India? Yet nevertheless amongst them those which are counted wise men are first bred up bare and naked. And yet suffer both the cold of the hill Caucasus, and also the sharpness of the winter, without any pain. And when they come to the fire, they are able to abide the heat, well nigh till they roast.

There is a very similar passage in an author Shakespeare would probably have studied at school, Valerius Maximus, who uses it to illustrate the virtue of endurance. Here, too, there is a reference to the icy Caucasus, to fire, and to wise men, and the use of the epithet 'naked' (iii. 3). This passage may have coalesced with the three Cicero passages to form Bolingbroke's lines:

O who can hold a fire in his hand
By thinking on the frosty Caucasus?
Or cloy the hungry edge of appetite
By bare imagination of a feast?
Or wallow naked in December snow
By thinking on fantastic summer's heat?
O no, the apprehension of the good
Gives but the greater feeling to the worse.

Shakespeare, however, used material he would not have found in the quotation-books. He knew Erasmus's *De Conscribendis Epistolis* and made use, while writing Friar Lawrence's consolation of Romeo, of his letter consoling a friend who had been sent into exile.² But for Gaunt's attempt

¹ Cf. T. W. Baldwin, *William Shakspeare's Small Latine and Lesse Greeke* (Urbana, 1944), ii. 427.

² Cf. R. Soellner, *N. & Q.*, cxcix (1954), 108-9.

to console his son he seems to have gone to a favourite quarry, *Euphues*.¹ Lyly prints a letter towards the end of the book, in which he remarks: 'Thou sayest banishment is bitter to the free borne, and I deeme it the better if thou bee wythout blame.' So Bolingbroke boasts: 'Though banish'd, yet a true-born Englishman.' Lyly continues: 'There bee manye meates which are sowre in the mouth and sharpe in the mawe.' Gaunt expresses a related idea: 'Things sweet to taste, prove in digestion sour.' Lyly continues:

I speake this to this ende, that though thy exile seeme grievous to thee, yet guiding thy selfe with the rules of Philosophie it shall bee more tollerable: hee that is colde doth not couer himselfe wyth care, but with clothes, he that is washed in the rayne dryeth himselfe by the fire not by his fancie, and thou that art bannished oughtest not with teares to bewaile thy hap, but with wisdom to heale thy hurt.

This passage, cited by Malone, is not so close to Bolingbroke's lines as the passages quoted from Cicero above, but it may have combined with them in Shakespeare's mind. Lyly proceeds to quote 'Plato': 'Plato would neuer accompt him banished that had the Sunne, Fire, Aire, Water, & Earth, that he had before, where he felt the Winters blast and the Summers blaze, wher the same Sunne & the same Moone shined, whereby he noted that euery place was a cuntry to a wise man.' So Bolingbroke comforts himself with the reflection: 'The sun that warms you here shall shine on me.' It will be observed that Lyly ascribes to Plato the Ovidian passage quoted by Erasmus. Possibly this was the link which reminded Shakespeare of *Euphues*. Lyly proceeds to tell an anecdote about Diogenes: 'When it was cast in *Diogenes* teeth that the *Synoponetes* had banished hym *Pontus*, yea, sayde he, I them of *Diogenes*.' So Gaunt urges his son: 'Think not the King did banish thee, / But thou the King.' Finally Lyly remarks that 'the Nightingale singeth as sweetly in the deserts as in the woodes of *Crete*', and this may have suggested Gaunt's reference to singing birds.

Herford suggested that Gaunt's speech owed something to a passage in *Edward II*, in which Leicester comforts the imprisoned King:

Be patient, good my lord, cease to lament;
Imagine Killingworth Castle were your court,
And that you lay for pleasure here a space,
Not of compulsion or necessity.

Gaunt urges his son:

Teach thy necessity to reason thus—
There is no virtue like necessity.

¹ Malone pointed this out. Cf. Bond's *Lyly* (Oxford, 1902), i. 313-16.

The idea was, of course, proverbial; but in both plays it is used in connexion with an appeal to use the power of imagination to rise above misfortune.

Another famous passage in *Richard II*, the speech in which Gaunt expatiates on England, and the context in which it occurs, likewise illustrates the way in which Shakespeare combined hints from a variety of sources. The idea of the whole scene was perhaps derived from Froissart,¹ who records that Gaunt spoke of the misbehaviour of the King and of his fatal readiness to accept evil counsellors. From *Woodstock* Shakespeare took several hints—the attack on foreign fashions, the phrase ‘pelting farm’, and the idea of the King as landlord:²

And we his son to ease our wanton youth,
Become a landlord to this warlike realm,
Rent out our kingdom like a pelting farm.

Two speeches of Gloucester in *Woodstock* are linked with the conclusion of Gaunt’s speech:

I would my death might end the misery
My fear presageth to my wretched country . . .

I wish my death might ease my country’s grief.

So Gaunt says:

Ah! would the scandal vanish with my life,
How happy then were my ensuing death.

Another source of *Richard II* was Daniel’s *Civil Wars*; and from the description of Flint Castle in that poem Shakespeare probably took the image of the cliffs spurning the waves (ii. 49). Daniel speaks of a rock

Whose surly brow imperiously commands
The sea his bounds that at his proud feet lies:
And spurns the waues that in rebellious bands
Assault his Empire, and against him rise.

So Gaunt speaks of

England bound in with the triumphant sea
Whose rocky shore beats back the envious siege
Of watery Neptune.

In the corresponding passage in *King John*, as Professor Dover Wilson points out, Shakespeare uses Daniel’s word ‘spurns’:

¹ Pointed out by Reyher, *Revue de l’enseignement des langues vivantes*, xli (1924).

² Ed. A. P. Rossiter (London, 1946), pp. 47–63.

Together with that pale, that white-faced shore,
Whose foot spurns back the ocean's roaring tides
And coops from other lands her islanders,
Even till that England, hedged in with the main,
That water-walled bulwark, still secure
And confident from foreign purposes

In other stanzas Daniel refers to the advantages of being cut off by the sea from the manners and morals of the continent (iv. 43, 90), and he asks:

With what contagion France didst thou infect
The land by thee made proud to disagree?

Neptune keepe out from thy imbraced Ile
This foule contagion of iniquitie. . . .

So Gaunt calls England

This fortress built by nature for herself
Against infection and the hand of war.

Professor J. W. Lever has recently argued¹ that Shakespeare adapted some lines translated by John Eliot from Du Bartas's in praise of France. As Shakespeare had read Eliot's *Ortho-Epia Gallica* before writing *Love's Labour's Lost*, it is probable that he knew these lines in which France is called 'most happie Land', a 'pearle', and an 'earthly Paradise'; in which there is a reference to the crusaders; in which the country is referred to as both mother and nurse; and in which there are references to walls and to the absence of plague: 'no plague thine aire doth trouble'. So Gaunt talks of 'this happy breed', 'this precious stone', 'this other Eden, demi-paradise', of the crusaders, of 'this nurse, this teeming womb', of a wall, and of a fortress built against infection. These eight links make it reasonably certain that Shakespeare was echoing Eliot's translation.² But the idea of England as an island-fortress was a familiar one in the years following the defeat of the Spanish Armada; and Shakespeare appears also to have read some stanzas by Thomas Lodge entitled 'Truth's Complaint over England'.³

Lodge links the idea of England as an island-fortress with a reference to paradise:⁴

Whilome (deere friend) it was my chaunce to dwell,
Within an Iland compast with the waue,

¹ *Shakespeare Survey* 6 (1953), p. 89.

² Shakespeare is closer to Eliot's version than to Sylvester's, which was in any case not published at this time.

³ Miss Dorothy Earnshaw called my attention to this.

⁴ Ed. Gosse (Glasgow, 1883), i. *Alarum*, p. 86.

A safe defence a forren foe to quell.
 Once *Albion* cald, next *Britaine Brutus* gaue,
 Now *England* hight, a plot of beaultie braue,
 Which onely soyle, should seeme the seate to bee,
 Of Paradise, if it from sinne were free.
 Within this place, within this sacred plot,
 I first did frame, my first contented bower,
 There found I peace . . .

Here the sequence of ideas is very close to that of Gaunt's speech—isle, earth, seat, demi-paradise, war, defensive, blessed plot.

There are several other links between Lodge's poem and this scene. Lodge, like York, complains of the import of foreign fashions (p. 86); and, also like York, he uses the image of the unbroken colt (p. 87). He, like Shakespeare throughout the play, compares England to an unweeded garden (p. 88); he speaks of the bramble growing at court (p. 89); he complains, like Gaunt, of flatterers and rack-rents (p. 90); and he shows that the happiness of the country depends on the conduct of the prince (p. 88).

Lodge's poem was published in a volume entitled *An Alarum against Vsurers* (1584), and there are a number of words and phrases which Shakespeare may have borrowed from this prose work. One sentence—'They be the caterpillars of a commonweale'—was used almost unchanged to describe Bushy, Bagot, and Green; though a similar phrase 'thieves and caterpillars of the commonwealth' was used by Harrison to describe sturdy beggars.¹

It may be thought that we have proved too much. If the idea of the demi-paradise protected by the sea is to be found in Eliot as well as in Lodge; if the attack on foreign fashions is to be found in Daniel and Lodge, and indeed in many other writers; if the description of the parasites as caterpillars of the commonwealth is to be found not merely in Harrison and Lodge, but in sermons and pamphlets paraphrasing a well-known biblical text; if the attack on rack-renters comes in *Woodstock* as well as in Lodge—is it really necessary to suppose that Shakespeare made use of all these sources? Is not the appearance of all these ideas and phrases in several different books a sign that they were all commonplaces?

Three answers may be given to these questions. First, it is fairly clear that Shakespeare did draw on the stock of contemporary commonplaces, and it is frequently impossible to know the precise source—and probable that Shakespeare himself could not have told us the precise source—of a phrase or idea. Secondly, although, as we have seen, many of the ideas, phrases, and images may be traced to more than one source, there appear to be enough peculiar to each one to prove that Shakespeare knew them all.

¹ Cited by M. W. Black, *Variorum* edn. (1955).

Thirdly, Livingston Lowes, in *The Road to Xanadu*, proved conclusively that a number of different sources were more likely to coalesce in Coleridge's mind if they had elements in common; and though Coleridge and Shakespeare differed in most ways there is no reason to doubt that they resembled each other in this. It is not, of course, suggested that Shakespeare deliberately read, or re-read, the various subsidiary sources before writing a speech or a scene. The coalescence was effective only because he had forgotten what he had read. The great poet, it has been said, is the one who forgets most.

KENNETH MUIR

SIMON FORMAN'S 'BOCKE OF PLAIES'

ALTHOUGH the controversy on the authenticity of this work no longer rages, it has not entirely settled and another note on the document may be worth while.

Bodleian MS. Ashmole 208 is a folio containing miscellaneous papers of Dr. Simon Forman, an astrologer, quack doctor, and man of low moral repute, who died on 12 September 1611. Folios 200-13—some of which are blank—contain notes in Forman's hand of four plays which he had seen in 1611. The plays are *Richard II* (not Shakespeare's play), *Cymbeline*, *Macbeth*, and *The Winter's Tale*. Forman gives a short account of each play and, except for *Cymbeline*, notes the date on which, and the theatre (the Globe) at which, he saw them.

He heads the document 'The Bocke of Plaies and Notes therof p formans for Common Pollicie'. This presumably means 'The book of plays and notes about them, by Forman, for general guidance', i.e. for a help and a warning to be prudent in the affairs of life.¹ Another possible interpretation is 'The book of plays and notes of performances thereof for my general guidance'. In the manuscript 'thereof' could be two words and 'p formans' one, but elsewhere Forman apparently signs himself 'fformans' on occasion and the earlier reading is perhaps correct.

The notes were discovered either by Philip Bliss or by W. H. Black in or before 1832. In 1845 Joseph Hunter, in *New illustrations of . . . Shakespeare*, i. 413, says: 'My attention was first drawn to these notes of Forman by my friend Dr. Bliss (to whom everything of this kind at Oxford is perfectly familiar), at the meeting of the British Association at Oxford in the summer of 1832.'

W. H. Black began to catalogue the Ashmole manuscripts in 1830 or 1831, and there is a note by Black on a proof-sheet of the catalogue against

¹ The notes to *R. II* and *W.T.* do contain comments of this kind.

the entry for the 'Bocke of Plaies' which reads, 'I made a transcript of this curious article, in 1832, for my friend J. P. Collier which he designed to print. He did so, but without the old orthography in [blank]'.¹

Collier was the first to publish the notes,² apparently relying entirely on Black's transcript. He says (in 1836) that he heard of the existence of the notes 'six or seven years ago' when he was working in the Bodleian, and he was in fact working there in 1830. The notes were printed, with facsimiles, by J. O. Halliwell-Phillips in his edition of Shakespeare of 1859 and they have been repeatedly used by editors of the three plays of Shakespeare since 1836. An easily accessible modern printing is that by E. K. Chambers.³

Since the notes were first printed by Collier their authenticity has naturally been challenged and there is controversial literature on the subject. The chief challenger is S. A. Tannenbaum,⁴ and what is widely regarded as the final establishment of authenticity is an article by Dover Wilson and R. W. Hunt,⁵ although there are still some who believe the document to have been forged by Collier between 1830 and 1832.⁶

A strong piece of evidence in favour of authenticity not used by Wilson and Hunt lies in Hunter's reference, because this is the first published record of the discovery and is in no way associated with Collier. It is, of course, awkward for Tannenbaum, who attempts to dismiss it by saying, 'Hunter's memory must have played him a trick', but as Hunter is so specific about the date⁷ this is unlikely to be so. Tannenbaum believes that Bliss would have seen the notes when he used Ashmole 208 for his edition of Wood's *Athenae Oxonienses* (1813-20). There is little reason to think that he did not do so: it is true that he did not publish the notes; but it would seem that he had spread news of his find, for, if Collier is truthful (and the question must be begged), someone knew and had been speaking about the notes before 1830. And this would be consistent with Bliss's character: unlike Collier he was not a publishing man. Rather than believe that Bliss did not see the notes before 1830 there is far more reason to think that had he found them in 1832 in a manuscript which he knew well, and on leaves which he had previously seen blank, he would at once have exposed them as a forgery. He did not do so and he was a meticulously

¹ The note was presumably written in or after 1836.

² In *New particulars regarding the works of Shakespeare in a letter to the Rev. A. Dyce* (1836).

³ *William Shakespeare* (Oxford, 1930), ii. 337-41.

⁴ Particularly in *Shakespearian Scraps* (New York, 1933), pp. 1-35, which gives a complete text.

⁵ 'The Authenticity of Simon Forman's *Bocke of Plaies*', *R.E.S.*, xxiii (1947), 193-200.

⁶ e.g. S. Race, in *N. & Q.*, xcxcvii (1952), 116-17; xcxcviii (1953), 531-2; cciii (1958), 9-14, 320.

⁷ The British Association met in Oxford in June 1832.

careful man; and the fact that Bliss accepted the notes as genuine is further strong evidence supporting their authenticity to be added to Wilson and Hunt's article.

The nature of the notes themselves is almost conclusive proof of their authenticity. All the weight of probability is against a forger devising such a motif as that of 'common pollicie', just as it would be in favour of a forger seeing to it that an astrologer noted all the supernatural or strikingly odd occurrences in the plays—which the 'Bocke' does not do. The notes seem genuine not only from what they contain but perhaps still more from what they omit. Furthermore, there is the handwriting: an examination of the manuscript and comparison with specimens of Forman's unquestioned hand leaves no room for doubt that the 'Bocke of Plaies' is quite genuine¹ and that the attack, on palaeographical as on other grounds, by Tannenbaum and S. Race is unfounded.

Altogether it may therefore be concluded that the notes are not a forgery by Collier or by anyone else but were written by Simon Forman in 1611.

J. H. P. PAFFORD

¹ Sir Walter Greg, in 1957, re-examined facsimiles of the 'Bocke of Plaies' and other examples of Forman's hand and reaffirmed his conviction that the 'Bocke of Plaies' is genuine (private information). Since these notes were written the authenticity of the 'Bocke of Plaies' on palaeographical grounds was established with practical certainty by Giles Dawson in a lecture to the Bibliographical Society on 17 February 1959.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE EDITOR, *Review of English Studies*

Sir,

While in full agreement with Part II of Mrs. Whiteley's article on 'Verse and its Feet' (*R.E.S.*, N.S. ix (1958), 268-78), I disagree profoundly with its first part, devoted to a defence of the concept of a basic five-foot line in English verse. And as Professor Prince, in his reply, declares himself converted to an acceptance of the concept, at least as far as Milton is concerned, it seems imperative for someone else to challenge Mrs. Whiteley's arguments and conclusions.

Of her two ways of inferring the need for the concept of 'a basic pattern of disyllabic rising rhythm' in English verse, that by 'logic' is the more readily disposed of. Even if Bembo's rule could be shown to imply that he postulated such a pattern in Italian hendecasyllables, logic would scarcely force us to accept this as evidence of its existence in English decasyllables. But in fact Bembo's rule can only be made to imply this by 'leaving aside' the possibility 'that the line is not on a disyllabic basis at all' (pp. 270-1). Thus logical demonstration is achieved by a curt dismissal of just those facts that make against what is to be demonstrated. And in the course of this dismissal Mrs. Whiteley shows how all her thinking is determined by the concepts of classical prosody, when she suggests that if we surrender the notion of the basic five-foot line we should be dealing instead with a line 'having a variable number of "measures"'. 'It means', she remarks, 'that Milton writes a line of ten syllables which may be at one moment a line of five measures, at another of four, at another of three' (p. 271). But if Milton followed Italian conceptions of prosody, as Professor Prince has argued in his excellent discussion of the problem (*The Italian Element in Milton's Verse*, pp. 131 ff.), he would have been as little concerned with measures as with feet, notional or actual, since the concern of Tuscan poets was solely with stresses and syllables, not with the division of the line into fixed units.

Mrs. Whiteley's second line of argument, her appeal to 'the evidence of our experience in reading verse', not being based on statistics, is inevitably the expression of a personal experience and so cannot carry much weight with those whose experience is directly opposed to hers; who, in reading English verse, are quite unable to hear, or even conceive in their minds, the ghostly patter of feet against which is counterpointed the actual rhythm of each line. Clearly their experience of reading Donne, for instance, must differ *toto caelo* from that of Mrs. Whiteley or that of Professor C. S. Lewis, who hears what he calls the 'ostensible metre' so powerfully behind the actual rhythms of Donne's verse that he can speak of it as 'speech with orchestral accompaniment' or *Sprechgesang*.¹

¹ P. 550 of his *English Literature in the Sixteenth Century*. The deserved influence of his admirable book makes it all the more needful to challenge this view.

Apart from the appeal to personal experience, Mrs. Whiteley's main defence of this counterpointing is that it leads to more complex and subtle rhythmic effects. But have we any business to import such effects if they were undreamt of by the poet? Her discussion of the line from the *Purgatorio* (pp. 271-2) is a case in point. The negative evidence clearly indicates that the notion of a basic pattern of disyllabic rising rhythm in his native verse was utterly foreign to Dante, as it has remained foreign to Italian poets and readers ever since. Mrs. Whiteley's delicate game of playing off single phrases against the notional base would have seemed to him a distracting and alien intrusion. With English poets the negative evidence against this concept of counterpointing is less decisive. But unless positive evidence in the form of written or spoken comments by individual poets is available, its application seems similarly indefensible.

The case against the retention of the concept of 'feet' in discussions of English verse seems to me, in fact, an unanswerable one. If we follow the deplorable practice (still all but universal in schools) of dividing up English verse lines into an assortment of feet, we are imposing the presumed fixities and certainties of classical prosody upon a medium which is essentially fluid, where the placing of stresses and pauses may vary not only from reader to reader but also from reading to reading. The result is an inevitable blunting and hardening of our response to verse rhythms. If we abstain from this use of the concept of 'feet' but follow the more recent fashion—but ultimately going back to Hopkins—of thinking of the five-foot line as providing a notional pattern against which we counterpoint any particular decasyllables, we are introducing an important but factitious element, based upon assumptions which we cannot back up with concrete evidence. And while the concept of the notional base does less harm than the dividing of lines of English verse into feet, it is bound to lead to distortions, as can, I think, be illustrated by Mrs. Whiteley's discussion of Donne's line, 'Both the year's and the day's deep midnight is'. It is true that the first six syllables are not tripping anapaests, as Grierson's notation might suggest, and that the voice needs to linger over the first, second, fourth, and fifth syllables, with a slight stress on 'and'. But it is the united impact of all the preceding lines—their varied rhythm, tone, theme, verbal music, and every other factor that goes to make up the poem—which determines this and not any 'fixed notional pattern of foot and stress'. To her charge that Grierson's marking seems to miss the right points of emphasis 'because it inclines to the view of prosody that denies the existence of feet, and so deprives the line of any constant rhythmic base' (p. 274), one must retort that her marking seems to miss the right points of emphasis precisely because of this preoccupation with the disyllabic base. Otherwise she would surely never have thought of accenting 'both' (which is quite unnatural and obscures the meaning), nor have considered placing the heaviest stress in the line on 'and' (which is merely ugly and ruins the line for me).

But I am glad that Mrs. Whiteley's article has once more brought up this important issue. It ought to be more widely discussed.

ERNEST SCHANZER

REVIEWS

The Homilies of Wulfstan. By DOROTHY BETHURUM. Pp. xiv+384. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957. 55s. net.

The Anglo-Saxonists of the sixteenth century ignored Wulfstan because he gave them no help in sectarian controversy. Junius, who knew him only as *Lupus*, transcribed a few homilies in the next century. Wanley listed the *sermones* somewhat breezily in his catalogue of 1705, but no one examined them critically until Arthur Napier came to prepare his edition of 1883, consisting of plain text and variants, which was so reliable that it served scholars well for three-quarters of a century. Meantime J. P. Kinard, working at Johns Hopkins University under Bright (1897), and C. F. R. Becher at Leipzig under Wülker (1910), had written exceptionally useful dissertations. In recent years, however, Wulfstan has received considerable attention. The rhythm of his sentences has been analysed by Angus McIntosh and the dialect of his vocabulary by Robert Menner. Karl Jost has published his comprehensive *Wulfstanstudien* (1950) and Dorothy Whitelock has issued a revised edition of *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos* (1952). The book under review therefore appears opportunely and, as it happens, it is produced in the same year as James Ure's attractive edition of the Old English text of the so-called *Benedictine Office*, whose prose framework is probably Wulfstan's, and N. R. Ker's long-awaited *Catalogue of Manuscripts containing Anglo-Saxon*. It is unfortunate that the latter volume has come too late for Professor Bethurum to be able to use it in her account of the eighteen relevant manuscripts. Naturally she refers to the appropriate page of Wanley and to the now superseded descriptions by M. R. James and C. H. Turner, which show some minor inaccuracies; but this proves no serious disadvantage since Ker's *Catalogue* is so clearly arranged that the student will lose no time in finding all the correct information he seeks. In any case Miss Bethurum's descriptions of individual manuscripts are too brief to be self-sufficient, space being rightly reserved for a display of the stemmata of single homilies and for a discussion of the canon which receives strong support from the almost identical conclusions already reached by Professors Whitelock, McIntosh, and Jost. The quadripartite arrangement under the headings Eschatological Homilies, The Christian Faith, Archiepiscopal Functions, and Evil Days, seems entirely satisfactory, since any attempt at chronological sequence would remain largely hypothetical.

The story of Wulfstan's life is exceedingly well told. He lived as a Benedictine monk in a Fenland community before being consecrated Bishop of London in 996, later succeeding Ealdulf as Archbishop of York and Bishop of Worcester in 1002, a plurality justified politically, if not canonically, on the ground that thus an opulent see in a peaceful diocese was joined to a poorly endowed archbishopric in a harassed province. Having consigned Worcester to Leofsige, Abbot of Thorney, in 1016, Wulfstan died as Archbishop of York on 28 May 1023, and was buried in that Ely Cathedral which he greatly loved. The trusted friend of both Ethelred and Cnut, he guided his country through troublous times. Miss

Bethurum deserves much praise for her long appreciation (pp. 69-87) of this eminent churchman as 'canonist, legislator, orator, translator, and collector of books', who is compared with his continental counterparts, Gerbert of Aurillac (later Pope Sylvester II) and Burchard of Worms, and contrasted with his English contemporary, Abbot Ælfric, 'living in relative retirement at Eynsham'. No less brilliant is her account (pp. 87-98) of Wulfstan's style, which presents the gathered results of recent research with discrimination and clarity. The sermons were all intended for public delivery and were sometimes 'varied within themselves' but occasionally 'all in the impassioned style'.

The text of the twenty-one homilies of the canon with their parallel versions, if any (pp. 113-277), is well arranged for the reader's convenience. Beneath the text stand those marginal glosses and comments which appear in many manuscripts, not a few in that notorious 'tremulous hand' associated with thirteenth-century Worcester. Under the glosses appear variant readings selected from manuscripts other than the best one chosen as the basis for the text. This means that the text may be confined to little more than the upper half of the page. Parallel texts are arranged in sequence: for instance, the famous *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos* of 1014 is rightly given in three separate texts recording the original version and the two subsequent stages of recension.

I have noticed no definite statement about editorial methods. Miss Bethurum's intention seems to be to give diplomatic texts, though occasionally she is driven to make emendations. She might indeed have emended a little more frequently to enable the student of Wulfstan to 'read and read until he can hear him talking' without unnecessary obstructions. In fact, however, he does receive some jolts and checks without any means of finding out whether these have genuine manuscript authority or are merely misprints. He reads, for example, *forwyrneð eorðlices wæstmæs*, 125.41, 'withholds earthly growth', where naturally he expects *wæstmæs* (C in the footnote); he reads *gebrocæð mænige man dihlíce*, 131.59, 'afflicts many a man (or men) secretly' where he expects either *mænigne man* or *mænige mæn*; and he finds in *ealra woruld*, 210.202 (repeated without a word of explanation in the introduction, 96.14), where he has every right to demand the liturgical in *ealra worulda woruld*. Unfortunately the text is far from immaculate in other respects. Sometimes *d* is printed for *ð* and the reader encounters marred spellings like *heonanford*, 137.49; *swyde*, 141.113; *lufiad*, 141.115 and 222.32; *gelerde*, 188.96; and *ðanonford*, 240.16. More disconcerting than these are other misprints that occur in the introduction, text, and notes, such as *unrihte* for *unriht*, 28.28; *gelimð* for *gelimpð*, 28.30; *sceolan* for *sceoldan*, 52.24; *gesettom gemæne* for *gesetton gemæne*, 73 n.; *swicdon* for *swicdom*, 91.2; *þas* for *þæs*, 91.20; *endelesse* for *endelease*, 91.21; *summan* for *sumum* or rare *suman*, 92.11; *witoð* for *witod*, 92.18; *gescurt* for *gescyrt*, 102.14; *fæstræde* for *fæstrædne*, 133.88; *helleswites* for *hellewites*, 218.179; *over* for *ofer*, 233.7; *hir* for *hit*, 234.31; *oferhogie* for *oferhogie*, 243.39; *dæda* for *dæde*, 245.77; *or* for *of*, 297.29; and *ægðen* for *ægðer*, 350.34. In Latin also errors occur. In the quotation attributed to Anselm *Scire Deum satis est, quod nulla scientia maior*, 84.26 we must read *quo*. We must substitute *incedeabant* for *indecebant*, 211.21; and *DEIS* or *DIS* for *DIES* in the title on pp. 221-4 (although the latter is a copyist's blunder in the

manuscript). 'His Capitula states', 299.30, and 'The Council . . . says he must *mergantur in aqua*', 317.27, are, to say the least, irritating. The obsolete *intensive* instead of the more usual *intensive* recurs many times in the introduction, where Byrhtferth's *Ramsey* appears four times as *Ramsay*, although it is correctly spelled *Ramsey* in the Index.

The notes (pp. 278-365) have been compiled with great labour and show the fruits of original investigation. They give much information about Wulfstan's sources based upon wide knowledge of patristic literature. It is so much the more regrettable that they fail to give the reader all the linguistic help he needs and that here and there they lead him astray. Take, for example, the rare and unexpected genitive plural termination in *-an* of the comparative adjective, as in *þonne geleanað manna gehwylcum ærran gewyrhta*, 126.65 and *gemyndig ærran behata*, 254.78, which have no note, though they might well baffle even an advanced student (cf. Sievers-Brunner, § 304, Anm. 2). Or take *he eac þæs tiða weorð*, 246.11, where we are told in the note that *tiða* 'receiver' is 'not elsewhere used in Wulfstan's homilies, nor is it in Ælfric's homily', but where we are not further informed that *tiða* or *tigða weorðan* is a well-attested legal expression 'to have one's request granted' (cf. *O.E.D.* under *Tithe*, a.²). In a note on *ealle cristene men syndon to Cristes limum getealde*, 200.6 'all Christian men are counted as members of Christ', we are wrongly directed to *O.E.D.*, *To*, A.17 and 17.b, for this use of the preposition 'appertaining or belonging to', and thus we are likely to overlook this important function of OE. *to* indicating 'for, as, by way of, in the capacity of', *O.E.D.*, *To*, A.11.b. Elsewhere in the notes an unwary reader may be misled by translations which convey the general sense but fail to give the precise signification. So, for example, (*Se bið Godes wiðersaca þe . . .*) *ðurh deofles lare of ðam deð ðe his cristendome to gebyrð*, 116.9, is rendered 'through the devil's teaching makes evil use of those things that belong to his Christianity', instead of, more closely, 'acts contrary to what pertains to his Christian calling'. Again, *hwilum gehatað hy ælnessan . . . oðþon to wyllle oððon to stane oðþon elles to sumum unalysfedum ðingum*, 148.85, is rendered 'and then they make offerings . . . either to wells or stones or to some other inanimate thing', instead of, more accurately, 'sometimes they promise alms to a spring or a stone or else to some unlawful objects', since stress is here being laid on the illegality of pagan rites.

These and other linguistic defects are easily rectifiable. Many scholars will doubtless feel that the general usefulness of this important book would have been greatly enhanced by the provision of a fuller index and by the addition of a glossary. The compilation of a complete glossary, like that appended to Klaeber's *Beowulf*, containing full references and classified contextual senses, not to mention obelized uniques, would have entailed arduous toil but it would have possessed quite exceptional value. It was a grievous loss to Anglo-Saxon scholarship that Napier never found time to write that linguistic commentary which he promised as the second volume to his edition of 1883. Dodd's useful *Glossary of Wulfstan's Homilies* (1908) no longer serves its purpose fully, since its compiler was not in a position to differentiate between genuine and dubious homilies and, in any case, it is unprocurable. Miss Bethurum's book reveals more clearly than

ever the outstanding qualities of Wulfstan's forceful vocabulary with its abundance of intensive adjuncts, its variety of picturesque compounds, and its wealth of linking correlatives. When all is said, it remains remarkable that this eminent statesman and ecclesiastic, whose upbringing and connexions were Anglian, should have expressed himself in a form of late West Saxon almost as conventional as Ælfric's but in choice of word and turn of phrase sufficiently different from his to warrant close and separate investigation. The book before us gives fresh impetus and coherence to such inquiry. It marks the culmination of a notable decade in the advance of Wulfstan studies.

SIMEON POTTER

The Saga of Gunnlaug Serpent-Tongue. Edited by P. G. FOOTE, translated by R. QUIRK. Pp. xxxi+89 (Nelson's Icelandic Texts). London: Nelson, 1957. 18s. net.

This is the first of a projected series of editions of early Icelandic texts, under the general editorship of two of the outstanding scholars in this field—Dr. Sigurður Nordal of Iceland and Professor G. Turville-Petre of Oxford. This first production will be of value primarily to students. Dr. Quirk's translation is extremely faithful to the original, at some expense, perhaps, to literary merit. On occasion one could disagree with minor points of interpretation (surely 'squire' for *bóndi* (farmer) gives a wrong impression of the social structure of medieval Iceland?), and the syntax is at times distinctly un-English. But this translation has the virtue, from the student's point of view, of conveying the actual structure of the Icelandic sentences as well as their meaning. The handling of the verses which stud the saga, however, is disappointing. The kennings of scaldic poetry are a nightmare for translators. But to translate them literally in a prose version, and then explain them in a footnote, is an abandonment of opportunity. One grave disadvantage of this policy is that the translator can make no distinction between verses of differing merit; verse 20, for instance, loses all the subtle tensions of its metaphor and reads just as incomprehensibly as other much inferior versifying. Some attempt should surely have been made to bring out its artistry even in prose, as Sir George Mackenzie did with some success when he translated this particular verse 150 years ago (*Travels in Iceland* (Edinburgh, 1811), p. 23).

The Icelandic text has presented Mr. Foote with no real difficulty; *Gunnlaugs Saga* is preserved in only two vellum manuscripts, and both of them have been very thoroughly investigated already. Mr. Foote has annotated the text carefully and given all the essential variant readings. His glossary of technical terms is also extremely useful, not only to beginners; the brief note on *Alþingi* is especially admirable and concisely informative. In his introduction, Mr. Foote does a great service to English-speaking students who have no access to the latest research into the development of the Icelandic sagas, most of which has been published only in Icelandic. Mr. Foote contents himself with a summarized account of this research, drawn chiefly from the Introductions of the *Íslenzk Fornrit* series. But there are dangers of over-simplification in this, all of which he has not escaped.

There is a growing tendency now to take for granted the theories that have been developed over the last few decades, with no more than a cursory examination of their premisses. The theory of the development of Icelandic prose literature, so compellingly expounded by Dr. Nordal throughout his writings, has hardened into unquestioned fact. For instance, on p. x, Mr. Foote says unequivocally, 'About A.D. 1190 the first stories were written of the Icelandic heroes of the Saga Age.' This is over-rash. Can anyone disprove that sagas were being written anything up to fifty years earlier than that? In the next sentence Mr. Foote writes: 'These sagas of Icelanders were based on oral traditions and earlier written records.' It would have been much more satisfactory if he had told us even a little about these 'written records', these ghost writings whose extent and form and number are pure conjecture. On the next page Mr. Foote comes out with the surprising statement that 'a development in the Eddic poetry of the late eleventh and twelfth centuries appears to provide a parallel to some part of the development in the later saga-literature'. It is sheer hypothesis to write boldly of Eddic poetry in this way. Which poems, if any, can be dated even within these broad bounds? Mr. Foote is making an unwarrantable assumption about certain unspecified Eddic poems in order to prove the existence of a literary taste which he then claims affected the prose of the next century. There are a number of these unsatisfactory 'factual' references to literary developments—'There had arisen a certain freedom in the handling of traditional material' (p. xi), 'This foreign influence appears to have been strongest in the years following the middle of the thirteenth century' (p. xii), &c.

It would be a pity if students derived from this otherwise admirable and invaluable addition to the library of British scholarship on Icelandic literature the misleading impression that this literature is quite as cut and dried as Mr. Foote appears to make it.

MAGNUS MAGNUSSON

The Chastising of God's Children and The Treatise of Perfection of the Sons of God. Edited by JOYCE BAZIRE and ERIC COLLEDGE. Pp. x+360. Oxford: Blackwell, 1957. 42s. net.

The two texts offered to modern readers for the first time in this volume stand apart from other known Middle English works in their indebtedness to the mystical writings of Ruysbroek. *The Chastising of God's Children* is the more important work in point of literary merit and on account of its greater prominence in the history of vernacular prose. It is a compilation, widely circulated in late medieval England, in the didactic and expository tradition of the *Ancrene Riwele*. Like that work, it is addressed to women religious and is intended as spiritual guidance. The editors have identified the sources of most of its material, which range from the *Collationes* of John Cassian to Alphonse of Pech's *Epistola Solitarii ad Reges* and a Latin version of *De Gheestelike Brulocht*, possibly Jordaens's translation, *De Ornatu Spiritualium Nuptiarum*. As we might expect, the *Ancrene Riwele* itself has supplied certain passages, and another source is *Horologium Sapientiae*. (Miss H. E. Allen, to whom all recent students of the

constituent elements of English mysticism in this period are indebted, first drew attention to the continental material in *The Chastising*, but attributed it to Tauler.) The editors have been able to establish that their second text, *The Treatise of Perfection*, is a closely literal translation made from Jordaens's Latin version of *Vanden blinckenden Steen*.

The Introduction demonstrates that *The Chastising* was itself a chief source of the later *Disce Mori* and *Ignorancia Sacerdotum*, and the editors have used the manuscripts of these treatises to supplement the nine manuscripts of the complete *Chastising* and de Worde's text. On this very substantial basis they have produced a critical text with fair claims to be authoritative. Mr. Colledge, who is responsible for the Introduction, discusses the relationship between the manuscripts with admirable lucidity, and his conclusions are fully convincing. His general approach to the literary interest of *The Chastising* is less assured than his account of its textual relations, but the work is helpfully and interestingly placed in its historical context of thought and devotion. It is shown to be a highly orthodox composition, in the main line of development of pre-Reformation consciousness. Lollardy, itself anti-mystical in its insistence on literal interpretation and its criticism of emotional indulgence in the devotional life, seems to have provoked an anti-mystical response in that age of heresies. So the author of this treatise shows a mistrust of all claims to 'singularete' and warns his readers of the spiritual dangers to which religious are particularly vulnerable, the fierceness of the attacks launched by the cardinal sins, and the perils of possession by evil spirits which may delude with false mystical experiences. A comment, on p. 78, that most medieval devotional literature teaches the contemplative way towards Perfection, needs some qualification, if *The Chastising* is not to seem more isolated than in fact it is. The growth of literacy among the laity, as well as the Lollard Movement, seems to have contributed to a shift of fashion in late fourteenth-century and early fifteenth-century religious literature. Manuals of self-examination and treatises relating to the practice of confession multiplied, in response to the new need; and the personal attitude of the author of *The Chastising* has much in common with the moralistic temper of such works. He does not reject the tradition in which mystical experience was valued and cultivated, certainly; but the caution earlier apparent in Hilton's expositions of contemplation is here magnified to the point where the graces of contemplative life are recognized chiefly in the paradoxical form of its tribulations.

The Treatise of Perfection is a more conservative document, which testifies to persistent interest in esoteric spiritual doctrine among individuals in the quiet backwaters of fifteenth-century life. The compression of material, which the editors have obviously found necessary throughout this volume, is especially evident in their introductory discussion of this text. They tell us that it exists only in the Amherst MS., owned by Greenhalgh of Sheen Charterhouse (Carthusian influence seems to have been largely responsible for the circulation of *The Chastising* and for fostering the knowledge of Ruysbroek in England) and comment that the state of the text makes it clear that this must be several times removed from the translator's autograph; but they have not been able to include any description of the manuscript—admittedly well known—or to set out the

evidence on which their conclusions are based. In fact, Mr. Colledge's article on *The Treatise*, in *English Studies*, xxxiii (1952), is a very necessary supplement to this edition for the curious reader. Similarly, there is no introductory comment on the language of *The Treatise of Perfection* and only a brief summary of conclusions regarding the dialects of the manuscripts of *The Chastising*. The editors have probably chosen wisely not to duplicate material available elsewhere and to use the space at their disposal for the discussion of matters of more general interest, but it is unfortunate that the footnote reference to Miss Bazire's article on 'The Dialects of the Manuscripts of "The Chastising of God's Children"', which occurs on p. 10, should be incomplete. (The omission is repaired in the Bibliography.)

The two texts confronted the editors with rather different problems. The principles on which they worked are fully set out and could form a model for the approach to late Middle English prose texts. Recognizing that absolute fidelity in representing the manuscript is properly the function of a facsimile, they have been boldly selective in recording variant readings in *The Chastising*. On the other hand, they have refrained from emendation of forms which make a kind of sense and may be genuine mistranslations, deliberate departures from the source, or reflections of corruption in the particular Latin manuscript which may have been used. With respect to *The Treatise of Perfection*, a manifestly literal, often obscure and unidiomatic translation, they have shown less reluctance to introduce emendations, on the basis of Jordaens's Latin. So 'of þe soonde of god' (*Chastising*, p. 182, l. 2) is retained, as an old corruption shared by all the manuscripts, although Jordaens has '*de manu dei*' (incidentally, *soonde*, in this conventional phrase, surely means 'visitation', or 'gift', not 'messenger', as Notes and Glossary state); whereas 'verrey trewe fayth is the sadde grownde and vertewe of alle halynesse' (*Treatise*, p. 236, l. 15) and 'thore is god pees and ryst' (*Treatise*, p. 257, l. 5) are corrected in the text, although there is no certainty that the errors are not derived from the translator's autograph. The method of presenting variant readings is less precise than one could desire: where more than a single word is in question, the editors have reasonably preferred to quote the whole variant phrase, instead of distinguishing the precise process of error, whether addition, omission, or substitution; but occasionally the exact limits of the basic reading to which the variant corresponds are left doubtful. Thus one reader, at least, remains unsure whether 'wip' (p. 100, l. 7) is omitted from W, Je, La, and whether 'but for a while' (p. 99, ll. 1-2) is included in J, or not.

The Glossary, for which Miss Bazire is responsible, is necessarily selective. It would have been helpful if *swagip* (p. 203, l. 3) had been included; and, as common words used with uncommon force are properly recorded (e.g. *derc* 'evil', and *lecherie* 'indulgence'), certain difficulties in *The Treatise of Perfection* might have been elucidated by an indication of the uses of *maner* to distinguish finite from infinite (e.g. p. 242, ll. 29, 32, 34; p. 246, l. 37). It may be noted that *sowneth* (p. 156, l. 8) is rendered '? sounds', though it is in fact used in the well-authenticated sense of 'pertains to', or 'tends to'; 'whose', instead of 'whoso', for *quasa* is an obvious misprint. But these are cavilling criticisms of an admirable edition.

MARGERY M. MORGAN

The Praise of Wisdom. A Commentary on the Religious and Moral Problems and Backgrounds of St. Thomas More's *Utopia*. By EDWARD L. SURTZ, S.J. Pp. x+402 (Jesuit Studies). Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1957.

Father Surtz is already well known as a Morian scholar and interpreter of *Utopia* in learned articles on Utopian Epicureanism, humanism, and communism, now incorporated in a companion volume, *The Praise of Pleasure*, simultaneously published by the Harvard University Press. The book under review confines itself to the consideration of the religious and moral problems raised in More's *Utopia*. The author modestly claims to 'produce additional evidence, throw more light, modify present interpretations, and draw new conclusions on intriguing but vexing problems' (p. viii). This is a promise amply fulfilled. If Father Surtz's arguments are not always new, such a wealth of learning is brought to bear on the discussion that what was conjecture becomes securely established fact, and, in addition, much new light is thrown on the precise meaning of *Utopia*, and new suggestions are offered for consideration. On the whole this closely reasoned study confirms Chambers's thesis that 'the virtues of Heathen Utopia show up by contrast the vices of Christian Europe'.¹ Basing his interpretation on contemporary humanist opinion and orthodox Christianity, Father Surtz places the *Utopia* firmly in its chronological context as a document of what is usually known as the Erasmian Reformation. If some of the evidence adduced is not immediately convincing because it may have been unknown to More, all the more weight must be attached to the ample quotations from More's own writings, as well as those of Colet, Erasmus, Plato, St. Augustine, Ambrose, Jerome, and the many schoolmen and humanists with whom More was familiar and whose works he was in the habit of quoting.

In view of Father Surtz's elucidation there can now be little doubt about the trend of More's thought or of his change of attitude, not of principle, after the appearance of Luther and the disturbances and bloodshed caused by the Reformation in Germany. That harsher side of More, which shows in his attitude toward heretics, is well brought out (pp. 59-60). Possibly Father Surtz goes a little too far in his emphasis on More's reformatory zeal at the time of the writing of *Utopia* (e.g. p. 221). If More's intention had been 'that the institutions of the Christian faithful should far outstrip the practices of the mere rational pagans' (p. 13; cf. p. 231), it is often difficult to see what practical measures More could have been aiming at. Hence I still believe that it was not so much the institutions of Christian Europe that More wanted to reform as the spirit. Sometimes also, although he recognizes it as a work of wit as well as wisdom, Father Surtz seems inclined to take the *Utopia* a little too seriously. In pursuit of his method everything said by More even in jest would become dead earnest, and reason itself would, in Father Surtz's own words, 'become logical to the point of absurdity' (p. 12). This is the notorious difficulty about More and about the *Utopia* in particular. Similarly some of the classical analogies may be no more than a display of learning without serious intention (e.g. pp. 93 and 207), and, on the

¹ R. W. Chambers, *Thomas More* (London, 1935), p. 127; quoted by Surtz, p. 12.

other hand, the belief in miracles attributed to the Utopians may have been less reflected than the author assumes, since More's intention may merely have been to throw a critical light on the contemporary unwillingness to concede their possibility (p. 99).

The author rightly gives full scope to Erasmus in his interpretation of More, but not least among his virtues is the discrimination between the views of More and his 'twin spirit' (pp. 195 and 251). The interpretation given is frankly Roman Catholic, but this is undoubtedly justified in view of More's explicit desire to conform with orthodox beliefs and the guidance of the Church, and Father Surtz must be given full credit for never winking at the actual existence of the abuses singled out by More and other humanists and reformers (e.g. pp. 133-5). His intimate knowledge of the period enables him also to discover practical suggestions for reform where, in the organization of the Utopian community, the lay mind would see only a purely reasonable arrangement (e.g. p. 160). The documentation is above reproach, although here and there it would have been preferable to have the references at the end of the sentence rather than lumped together at the end of the paragraph. Even so the author would seem to speak sometimes with too great an assurance of what was More's actual experience (p. 190) or to lead the reader to assume a direct instead of an implied reference (p. 86), but this may only be a question of wording.

Father Surtz is as much at home among the complex ironies of the warfare of Utopians as among the reasonable tenets of their religion and morals, but the main stress is on the latter. Here the whole weight of the contemporary ideology and the entire tradition of the Church are brought to bear on the interpretation. If one were to find any fault with his treatment of the former it would be that it tends to become too literal. Thus I cannot help thinking that many of the Utopian practices in war were intended to act as deterrents to Europeans rather than being seriously visualized as practised by the noble Utopians. When Father Surtz exclaims: 'If Europeans grow angry at such Utopian tactics, More can turn the accusation against them: you do the same!' (p. 312), surely the irony is more subtle than that.

However, any objections that suggest themselves must wither away before the recognition of the immense gain that Father Surtz's book brings to our knowledge of *Utopia* and, in a broader sense, of the whole period. There is hardly a single point where he does not add to our knowledge. To choose only one instance, his distinction between slavery and penal servitude is new and valid (p. 261). Contrary to the opinion previously held, Father Surtz shows the Utopian institution to have been slavery in the strict sense (p. 268). Its implication, however, is subject to the hazards of interpretation, and one feels tempted to question the conclusion that More disapproved of it (p. 269). The objection seems obvious that the employment of criminals in manual labour is useful to the community and contrasts too sharply with the European abuse of the death penalty to enable us to dismiss it as an institution necessarily disapproved of by More, however distasteful servitude of other kinds might have been to him, and perhaps attributed to the Utopians only on the strength of classical parallels. It would seem, on the contrary, that where the Utopians have both reason and

religion on their side a criticism of Europe and approval of Utopia must be implied. No such doubts, however, can detract from the value of Father Surtz's interpretation, which is by far the most authoritative we have or are likely ever to possess, an interpretation which would be final if finality were possible in the case of *Utopia*.

H. W. DONNER

The Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare. Edited by GEOFFREY BULLOUGH. Vol. I, Early Comedies, Poems, *Romeo and Juliet*. Pp. xx+532. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1957. 45s. net.

The ceaseless activity of modern Shakespearian scholarship is all too rarely devoted to the supply of recognized desiderata, and there will be much satisfaction that Professor Bullough has embarked upon this necessary and exacting task. This book will do more than merely supersede its predecessor, W. C. Hazlitt's collection of 1875. It is splendidly produced, with a care for detail consonant with dignity and permanence.

It is as yet too early to comment at large upon the editor's procedures; many of his most difficult problems lie ahead, and the general essay in which he will deal with questions of method is reserved to the last volume. It is nevertheless interesting to see how he has resolved some of the problems already presented to him. There is, for instance, the matter of chronology, which not only governs the order in which the material is printed, but also affects the editorial comment on Shakespeare's handling of it. Mr. Bullough is here conventional, staying close to Chambers, and having little to do with the 'early start'; he makes considerable use of Professor T. W. Baldwin's books, but silently dismisses their heterodox chronology. More complex problems arise from the need to determine the status of the material in relation to Shakespeare. Here the editor must make up his mind about the relevance of analogues, as well as about such questions as the availability of translations and Shakespeare's linguistic equipment. Mr. Bullough will doubtless go fully into all this; in the meantime he gives each section of his material one of these headings: Source, Translation of Source, Probable Source, Possible Source, Analogue. Some of the difficulties of this final class are acutely evident in *The Merchant of Venice* and *A Midsummer-Night's Dream*; Professor Muir's work on 'multiple sources' is mentioned in an editorial allusion to this. (Curiously enough, Mr. Muir's volume on the sources is not included in the bibliography, nor is the work of Professor V. Whitaker, also mentioned in the Preface.)

The selection of material is as generous as one could desire. For example, in the section on *The Comedy of Errors* we have the whole of the *Menaechmi* in Warner's translation and ten pages of the *Amphitruo* in the modern version of E. H. Sugden. In the *Shrew* section we are given the whole of *A Shrew* and Gascoigne's *Supposes*. For *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* we are provided with brief extracts from Elyot (Possible Source), Lyly (Analogue), Sidney (Analogue); a long passage from Yonge's translation of Montemayor (Translation of Source); and finally versions of analogous Italian and German plays, the last in a new

translation. The quantity of material in the volume may be judged from the fact that Brooke's *Romeus and Juliet*, for all its 3,000 lines, occupies only 80 out of over 500 pages. The job is being done with sensible lavishness, and the editor can claim with justice that his book serves a secondary purpose as 'an anthology of Elizabethan reading'.

To each section the editor has prefixed an introduction. These essays are full of information, and their terseness, which occasionally seems to exclude from consideration possible counter-arguments, is clearly essential if the project is to be contained in reasonable space. There are one or two slight disappointments, particularly, I felt, with the poems. The interesting question of how Adonis was converted into a reluctant lover is not tackled; there is no allusion, in text or bibliography, to the various attempts that have been made to relate *Lucrece* to a pictorial source or tradition. Finally, there is the certainly very difficult problem of dealing with allusions, nowhere more trying than in *Love's Labour's Lost*; Mr. Bullough expressly states that his book 'is not the place' for treatment of the Nashe-Harvey elements, or 'the fascinating "Schoole of Night" theories'. It is true that the Bibliography will enable the reader to pursue these theories (incidentally, it includes Mr. Strathmann's first onslaught on the 'Schoole' but not his book on Raleigh); but if Miss Yates is right about the play, its sources are very inadequately represented here. How one would proceed to represent them is another, and a nightmarish, matter.

But even this is unfair criticism when only one volume has appeared, and the editor cannot for some time justify his methods. The important point is that this really impressive compilation is now in progress, and that it is meticulous in the editing, handsome in the production, beyond the deserts of an age which has affected to despise the study of sources.

FRANK KERMODE

Kommentar zu Shakespeares Richard III. Interpretation eines Dramas.

By WOLFGANG CLEMEN. Pp. 356. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1957.

Professor Clemen's book on *Richard III* is based on the realization that already in this early play the various constituents of drama, such as style, structure, themes, and action are more closely interrelated and do more fully reflect each other than in the work of previous dramatists. This interrelationship, the author claims, can best be demonstrated when the method of a scene-by-scene commentary on the text is adopted. This method, he explains, has the further advantage of enabling one to combine a large number of divergent approaches to Shakespeare's plays and thus to avoid the distortions resulting from one-sided and exclusive methods of analysis.

Next to this main object of exhibiting the close interrelationship of the various dramatic elements and the inner coherence and unity of the play, Dr. Clemen's principal concern has been to compare Shakespeare's treatment of typical scenes and motifs with that found in the plays of his predecessors. This second concern is really ancillary to the first. For the comparison invariably brings out the much greater subservience of such elements in Shakespeare's play to the immediate requirements of the scene and the presiding conceptions of the play as a whole.

He shows, for instance, how Margaret's curse has a unifying function of which no trace is found in the conventional curse in pre-Shakespearian drama.

Dr. Clemen is never content with such question-begging terms as 'Senecan influence', but is always concerned with showing why such an influence should have been allowed to manifest itself in a particular scene, and how conventional elements are revitalized and put to a more economic and organic use than in previous drama. This is illustrated in his discussion of Tyrrel's monologue (p. 242) and in his admirable analysis of the functions of the formalized verse-pattern at the beginning of iv. iv (p. 252).

The author's choice of *Richard III* for close study is prompted by two kindred considerations. First, the fact that this play provides a pre-eminent example of Shakespeare's fusion of popular and classical drama (*Handlungsdrama* and *Rededrama*), the two opposed forces which Dr. Clemen explored with such astuteness in his book on pre-Shakespearian tragedy. A study of the ever-varied mingling of these two modes is one of the main objects of the book under review. And, secondly, there is the recognition that in this play, better than anywhere else in Shakespeare, can be studied his transmutation of conventional material to serve his dramatic ends.

To this study Dr. Clemen brings not only his great erudition, but much shrewd insight and discrimination. He is always careful not to oversimplify, not to do violence to the complexity of the play. His discussion of the relation of each scene to its sources is exemplary in its broad scope and imaginative treatment. If in spite of all this there are stretches when the reader nods a little and, ungratefully, is inclined to murmur with Christopher Sly, 'tis a very excellent piece of work . . . would 'twere done!', the fault lies in the devastating thoroughness with which the author has pursued his task, his unwillingness to leave anything unsaid. One would gladly have sacrificed some of the more pedestrian or largely descriptive portions of the commentary for a few pages of conclusions, which, we are told, had been originally planned but were omitted, partly to save space. It is cold comfort to be directed, in a 'do-it-yourself' spirit, to the very detailed and useful *Schlagwortregister* at the end of the book, with the help of which the reader can work out his own conclusions.

A number of trivial slips are found scattered through the book. Only rarely does the author provoke disagreement over points of interpretation. One or two of these may be mentioned. In his discussion (p. 308) of Richard's soliloquy in v. iii Dr. Clemen seems to miss the fact that his 'inward punishment' is also, in the main, a fulfilment of Margaret's curse (i. iii. 221-6), and is at least to some extent prepared for by this fact and by Anne's allusion to his 'timorous dreams' (iv. i. 85). In his remark that there is no inner conflict in *The True Tragedy* he ignores the evidence of Richard's soliloquy in ll. 1398 ff. of that play, where the inner struggle is quite as explicit as in *Richard III*. It is puzzling to be told (p. 239) that iv. ii precedes the following scene by only a few minutes, when in fact a time-gap of several days is indicated. Once such an interval is granted, it seems unnecessary to speak of any *Zeitraffung* and *Zeitverkürzungen*.

As Dr. Clemen himself points out in his introduction, this commentary cannot become a model for the treatment of other Shakespeare plays, for each

demands a unique procedure adapted to its peculiar nature. But the book can serve as a model of the way in which erudition, imaginative insight, and unrelenting sanity can happily co-operate in the elucidation of a single work of art.

ERNEST SCHANZER

Jonson and the Comic Truth. By JOHN J. ENCK. Pp. x+282. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1957. \$5.00.

Shakespeare and Jonson. By S. MUSGROVE. Pp. 56 (The Macmillan Brown Lectures 1957). Auckland: University College, 1957.

There are strikingly few critical works on Jonson, and Mr. Enck offers a welcome addition to them. He has clearly utilized the scholarly commentaries, but his aim has not been to produce another work of scholarship; indeed he occasionally becomes impatient with scholars, as when he refuses to become entangled with the complicated hypotheses of the historians of the *Poetomachia*. *Jonson and the Comic Truth* is a study of Jonson's aims and methods in his stage plays—including the tragedies as well as the comedies, but omitting the masques and the non-dramatic verse and prose. The account given of Jonson is therefore only partial, but by confining himself to the stage-plays only Mr. Enck can claim, and with some justice, that he is applying himself to what is of most direct interest to the modern reader.

He approaches the plays chronologically, trying to isolate in each one some central core of meaning, and examining as he proceeds the different aspects of Jonson's genius as they unfold. It is a good method, and goes a long way towards countering the often-repeated judgements that Jonson's work is superficial and all his plays are the same. That this is not true should be obvious to the careful reader, but Mr. Enck leaves even the careless without excuse for believing it. He demonstrates the way in which Jonson changed his strategy from play to play to meet different demands, both from himself and from his audience, and in the process offers some interesting and valuable insights. He is quite right to point out, for example (although the point is not entirely a new one) that *Every Man in his Humour* is at least as closely related to *The Case is Altered* as it is to *Every Man out of his Humour*, and to emphasize the experimental nature of *E.M.O.* and its uniqueness among Jonson's plays. He is less good on the two plays that follow, but he has some interesting ideas about the great comedies, and can and does distinguish what is good as well as what is bad about the last plays, which Dryden so contemptuously dismissed as Jonson's 'dotages'. His attempts to see through to a central core of inspiration in the plays are not uniformly successful, but he is much more successful than one would expect in tracing image-patterns or dominant symbols in many of the plays—images of coldness and sterility in *Epicoene*, for example. This kind of approach can never be as rewarding in Jonson as it is in Shakespeare; the interesting thing is that it produces any results at all. Much of what Mr. Enck says is suggestive and illuminating—at any rate to someone who knows the plays well already; his book would confuse rather than help a new reader—and some of his general observations on Jonson are valuable. 'Two axioms apply to all Jonson's writing: nothing

is accidental, and deliberateness does not produce results': the judgement is not novel, but it is well and forcibly expressed.

Unfortunately, although one might say that the whole of *Jonson and the Comic Truth* is forcibly written, too much of it is anything but well expressed. To say this is not merely to make pedantic English objections to Americanisms. One objects only mildly to the description of the stock comparison between Shakespeare and Jonson as 'this fixed match where the seventeenth-century underdog emerges the all-time world champion' (pp. 4-5), or to being told that Garrick assigned to Abel Drugger 'a nearly stellar spot' (p. 152). But when the restraint of Jonson's tragedies is explained by the fact that he was 'almost congenitally . . . incapable of sketchy razzle-dazzle, four-man armies, hobby-horses and sesquipedalian words' (p. 180), one begins to feel that in the effort to achieve interest and excitement the style is being—perhaps 'souped-up' is the correct expression?—beyond tolerable limits. This phrenetic use of language now seems obligatory in certain transatlantic schools, presumably as a guard against accusations of scholarly remoteness. One objects to it not merely on grounds of taste, but because of its sheer unintelligibility. 'Sejanus' first step must be accepted as a gratuitous act, after which everything evolves with a single emphasis upon the drive to rise amplified by a dread of falling so compulsive that success changes to a migraine of acrophobia, whipping the sufferer ever higher' (p. 94). It takes too long to find out what such a sentence means, before one can decide whether one agrees with it or not. There are simply too many such sentences in *Jonson and the Comic Truth*, and they resemble nothing so much as barbed-wire entanglements which hinder, where they do not positively prevent, the reader from penetrating to the often interesting meaning.

Again, one may sympathize with Mr. Enck's refusal to deal in the minutiae of scholarship, but not with his occasional unscholarliness. To say that Jonson 'never repeated himself' (p. 17) is acceptable only if it is heavily qualified, and there are many such *obiter dicta* which need explanation, but do not get it. There are also some positive errors of fact. Puntarvolo's journey to Constantinople is to be made with his dog and cat, not with his dog and wife, for example (p. 55). Epicene is not a boy-actor hired by Dauphine (p. 135 and again on p. 144), but as Dauphine says, a gentleman's son whom he has trained for the practice on his uncle. Cutbeard in the same play is hardly correctly described as a 'barber-detective' (p. 134). Fulvia in *Catiline* does not side with the rebels (p. 173)—indeed it is very important that she does not. Nor does the first Chorus in the same play chant 'a dirge on the theme of the dangers of extended frontiers' (p. 177); it is on the common theme that riches are corrupting Rome and enslaving her to the vices of those countries which she has conquered. Slips of this kind are not grave, but they need not have been made, and they undermine one's confidence in the superstructure of Mr. Enck's book; they suggest that some, at least, of his judgements were too hurriedly made, without a thorough consideration of all the relevant facts. *Jonson and the Comic Truth* is a stimulating book, but of the kind which stimulates most when one disagrees with it; it is a useful adjunct to existing studies of Jonson (and should be read after them), rather than a definitive study in its own right.

Professor Musgrove's three lectures are less ambitious in their scope. His primary concern is to relate Jonson and Shakespeare, and to suggest that far from being the fell and mighty opposites they are (or were) often reported to be, they may in fact have been on terms of close friendship, and have influenced each other very directly. In his first lecture he notices in the main verbal resemblances in the works of the two writers; in his second he makes an interesting comparison between *Volpone* and *King Lear*; in his third he speaks of the 'romantic' quality of Jonson's imagination. He makes some interesting points, although some of his comparisons strike one as a little overstrained. Since these are printed lectures some matters of detail have had to be stated with more certainty than the facts altogether warrant. One cannot quarrel with this, but it is still a pity that Fuller's account of the 'wit-combats' between Shakespeare and Jonson is quoted as if it were an eye-witness account; it would not have taken much longer to point out that Fuller was eight when Shakespeare died.

J. B. BAMBOROUGH

The Metaphysical Poets. Selected and edited by HELEN GARDNER. Pp. 328 (Penguin Poets). London: Penguin Books, 1957. 5s. net.

This anthology invites—we might almost say it challenges—comparison with the famous one edited by Sir Herbert Grierson in 1921, to which Miss Gardner pays due homage. It included some 150 pieces, and its competitor has about half as many again. Over 100 of Grierson's choices are retained, which shows a substantial agreement on what metaphysical poetry is at its purest. The introduction confirms this impression since it contains little that contradicts Grierson's, but it of course tries to elaborate the definition he gave, thus condensing the results of over thirty years of exuberant critical activity, yet bearing Miss Gardner's unmistakable impress. Since I must limit myself here to the most striking feature of this volume, I shall note its attempt at extending the scope of metaphysical poetry. First, by including some of Donne's predecessors who are credited with having paved the way for his innovations: Sir Walter Raleigh, Fulke Greville, Southwell, Shakespeare (in *The Phoenix and the Turtle*), Alabaster, and Sir Henry Wotton all precede Donne . . . in this anthology. But we must object that, while their birth-dates undoubtedly entitle them to do so, not one of the poems given is certainly earlier than Donne's earliest attempts and most of them are certainly later. However, since Miss Gardner admits their position in the metaphysical domain is peripheral, we shall not attach to chronology more importance than her own conclusion does to delimitation. And we shall grant that at the other end she is justified in extending the metaphysical lineage farther than Grierson did: Traherne, Rochester (at times), Thomas Heyrick, Richard Leigh, and John Norris of Bemerton, the last two of course not yet unearthed in 1921, provide the final dozen poems. Within the period covered by Grierson ('Donne to Butler', his sub-title said) the most notable additions are Ben Jonson, Thomas Randolph, and (most venturesome of all) Edmund Waller. In the selection of pieces from the unquestionable metaphysicals the boldest accessions are 'The Flea', which I welcome since it helps much to understand reputedly

more earnest poems, and 'Going to Bed', which sounds somewhat defiant: why then not include Carew's 'Rapture', which is ever so much better poetry and not much less metaphysical?

The text has been edited according to very subtle and refined rules, in order to give the reader the best aesthetic value, yet without falling into eclecticism. Since the spelling and the punctuation are sometimes modernized, though ever so little, one might suggest that the puzzling 'where in all sorts' should become 'wherein all sorts' on p. 100 (cf. p. 102), and that in *The Phoenix and the Turtle* the superfluous full-stop at the end of the eleventh stanza should be transferred to the end of the sixth. The notes obviously had to be severely limited in number; otherwise it might have been useful, for instance, to warn the Penguin reader that *remorse* (p. 162) meant 'pity'. We may discuss some of the notes on Donne's love poems when Miss Gardner's full-scale edition of them comes out. But we shall look twice before we call any statement of hers in question. What seemed at first a slip (p. 65, n. 2), viz. the calling of 'similia similibus curantur' (apropos of 'Loves Growth', ll. 7-8) 'the old medical doctrine', 200 years before Hahneman's homoeopathy, turns out to be at worst an over-concise and possibly misleading description: though 'contraria contrariis curantur' undoubtedly was the old medical doctrine, yet the other method is mentioned already, I now know, by Hippocrates, though as of infrequent application.

But let us now revert to the main question, and answer it: this new anthology, where so much loving care combines with such scholarship, does stand comparison with its predecessor, and we shall wish it as long a career and as strong an influence, over a wider public; for since culture, or the desire for it, reaches ever deeper strata in English society, it may well be that the future historian of literature will conclude: 'Grierson hit his thousands, but Gardner her ten thousands.'

PIERRE LEGOUIS

Images and Themes in Five Poems by Milton. By ROSEMOND TUVE. Pp. viii+162. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; London: Oxford University Press, 1957. 25s. net.

Professor Tuve's decisive achievement has been the demonstration that some late Renaissance writings cannot be rightly understood in detachment from their literary context. She now seeks to show, in separate studies, that among these are *L'Allegro*, *Il Penseroso*, the *Hymn on the Morning of Christ's Nativity*, *Lycidas*, and *Comus*. Her contention is that each has at its centre certain great thematic figures, which were fitted by centuries of intricate use to present conceptions of the utmost complexity and depth; and she attempts, by reconstructing the forgotten tradition of theme and figure in which the poems were written, to set aside trivializing misreadings common since Johnson. A measure of unity is given to the five studies by the recurrence of a few cardinal concerns: the pastoral tradition, the allegorical habit of thought, the universalizing tendency of traditional figures, the nature and functioning of metaphorical language.

There can be no doubt of the firmness of Miss Tuve's ground, or of the value of her approach to Milton. Her manner is irritatingly occult; her methods of

bringing and handling evidence do not always inspire confidence; but her apprehension of the drift of source materials provided by recent scholarship has manifestly brought her to an understanding of the central conventions of these poems such as has scarcely been possible since Milton's own time. It is a perception which enables her to cut decisively through the haggling over the old Johnsonian cruces. Miltonic pastoral emerges as a device of infinitely richer import than talk of pathetic fallacy and ornament suggests, a means of showing the interdependence of all created nature in a unity of which man was still felt to be part. The inadequacy is demonstrated of any view of the language and imagery of these poems which does not take account of the continuity of the Renaissance with the Middle Ages in its allegorical, or emblematic, mode of interpreting phenomena (and here it is accurately observed that such phenomena include the properties of pagan poetry, which could be used in Christian contexts entirely without strain because they had for centuries shared in the christianizing, by allegorical means, of the major pagan writings). Post-romantic reading habits, implicitly assuming private reference, are shown to run counter to a figurative tradition whose broad tendency was extensive and inclusive. The controlling importance of genre is emphasized, more particularly by a reading of *Comus* which brushes aside familiar ponderings over such matters as dramatic ineffectiveness, and priggishness about chastity, in favour of a searching and satisfying account of the poem as masque, a revelation by means essentially allegorical, and very complex, of the whole human condition. This latter study indeed carries peculiar conviction by reason of Miss Tuve's discernment in *Comus* of a kind of running *double entendre* integrated with the allegorical intention, an exhilarating consequence of Milton's ingenious exploitation of that convention of the masque which allowed the participants to be at once dramatic personages and themselves. This is certainly wit as the Renaissance understood it; and Milton momentarily shows himself heir of a tradition which included Spenser as well as Donne and Jonson.

Elsewhere it may be felt that Miss Tuve plies with misjudged inflexibility the conventions she has traced, particularly that concerning universality. In her accounts of *L'Allegro*, *Il Penseroso*, and the *Hymn*, over-anxiety to prove the widest inclusiveness produces exaggeration; though there are some outstandingly just single readings, and a good case is made out for a considerable degree of generality. Strain is most uncomfortably apparent in the study of *Lycidas*, where the attempt to take Milton out of the poem and vastly extend its reference results in continued forcing, both of readings and of tone. The lack of restraint which strikes one here, particularly in the prose paraphrases, betrays an incautious devotion to a grandiose but dangerously loose view of metaphor, again designed to allow the widest generality—'each of the so-called pastoral conventions is, like any metaphor, open at one end to allow interpretations that go as deep as a man's knowledge of life will take him' (p. 86). There are modes of metaphor which this finely describes. Its pertinence to the figurative techniques of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries is narrowly limited.

It is a fault of the book that in trying to do several things at once it becomes obscure. Footnote polemics are a constant distraction. A theory of metaphor is

developed so obliquely (and again partly in footnotes) that one cannot be certain if Miss Tuve's position is as thoroughly transcendentalist as it sometimes seems to be—'the conception that a *real* thing is a shadow of a real other meaning . . . is basic to Elizabethan metaphor' (p. 54). If this refers to a transcendental other meaning it is not what the great majority of Renaissance theorists taught, or what rhetorical techniques commonly produced. There are a number of syntactical oddities, some of them evidently misprints: 'the poems does' (p. 40), 'This own thrice-used word' (p. 42), 'In all that wherein she is creature, mere nature.' (p. 50), 'The valleys are bid by the Muse' (p. 103).

This is none the less an important book.

A. J. SMITH

Politics and the Poet. A Study of Wordsworth. By F. M. TODD. Pp. 238. London: Methuen, 1957. 25s. net.

Professor Todd's aim is 'to investigate and document Wordsworth's notorious change of political heart'; 'an explanation and not a defence of Wordsworth's political development' (pp. 11-12). A general knowledge of this development is, of course, common to all who study the relation of Wordsworth's life to his poetry; and little in the way of new biographical material is to be expected. Nor is much offered: on p. 47 it is conjectured that Wordsworth's mysterious stay in Paris in the autumn of 1792 was prolonged by difficulty in obtaining a passport—a temptingly simple and precise explanation; on p. 103 an entertainingly garbled reference to Wordsworth and Coleridge in Germany is unearthed from *The Anti-Jacobin Review*. Mr. Todd writes without the advantage of Mrs. Moorman's *William Wordsworth* before him; if he had had it, he would have avoided seeming to imply that the Wordsworth family took no legal proceedings against Lord Lonsdale (p. 18; Moorman, pp. 167 ff.), and that James Losh was certainly Wordsworth's friend at Cambridge (p. 26; Moorman, p. 263); or misidentifying the Mr. Nicholson with whom Wordsworth heard Fawcett (pp. 55-56; Moorman, p. 219). With or without Mrs. Moorman, he should not have called Wordsworth's publisher Charles Moxon (p. 24); and the subject which Wordsworth and Coleridge agreed early not to discuss was surely religion, not politics (p. 94). It is hard to see why Mr. Todd hints at a visit to the Wye earlier than 1793 (p. 63), why he says that most of *The Female Vagrant* was written in 1794 (p. 68; in May 1794 Wordsworth told Mathews that it was 'written last summer'), or why the usually admirably clear preface to *The Borderers* is called 'tortured' (p. 89).

These lapses are minor. The virtue of Mr. Todd's book lies in its emphases upon familiar material, especially upon that concerned with the first half of Wordsworth's life. The most important of these is that Wordsworth 'was slowly driven to a political position . . . inherent in the interpretation of human life expressed in his poetry . . . the superficial liberalism of the *Lyrical Ballads* concealed all the elements of an outlook essentially conservative' (p. 12). This thesis, of an almost paradoxical approach, first from the political and then from

the literary Left, to a poetry which sings the praises of the *status quo* (or an idealized *status quo*), is forcefully and convincingly developed in the first half of the book.

Of the minor emphases, the following seem especially worthy of serious consideration: that, after a period of war, sympathizers looked to revolutionary France as the source of perpetual peace (pp. 50-51); that Wordsworth's liaison in France had, perhaps, a less sentimental basis than *Vaudracour and Julia* and biographers who rely on it imply (pp. 52-53, 232); that 'the retirement to the Lakes . . . was a return home, a physical expression . . . of his deliberate reaching back over the years of his early manhood' (p. 107). Another (important if it could be proved), concerning the famous 'crisis' of the mid-90's, seems to be disproved by chronology. Mr. Todd argues (pp. 74 ff.) that, on the death of Robespierre, Wordsworth had new hopes of France which were shortly disappointed by events; this disappointment caused his return to a Godwinian 'complete rationalism' which, when seen to be inadequate to Wordsworth's situation, provoked 'the crisis of the strong disease'. The cure was effected, says Mr. Todd, by 'Dorothy and . . . by nature' at Windy Brow in 1794, rather than at Racedown in 1795. But Dorothy left Windy Brow in June 1794 and did not rejoin Wordsworth till autumn 1795, whereas Robespierre died in July 1794 and Wordsworth heard of his death in August at Rampside. Moreover, early texts of *The Prelude* include Coleridge as an agent in the cure, and Wordsworth did not meet Coleridge till late summer 1795. Mr. Todd's dating is therefore unacceptable, quite apart from any significance we may give to Wordsworth's meetings with Godwin in 1795, recently reported by Mrs. Moorman and others.

It seems inevitable that biographical studies of Wordsworth as poet shall decline in interest as the man ages, and the later chapters of this book hardly escape the charge. After the opening pages of chapter viii, we are given much politics and almost no poetry, as Mr. Todd confesses on p. 214. His commentary is full and painstaking; but we feel, as Crabb Robinson felt as early as 1826,¹ that events were no longer working on a vital mind. We are warned several times that history makes events clearer than they seem when they occur, and that 'we must not expect a man to be wiser than the facts of his experience will allow him to be' (pp. 13-14, cf. pp. 152, 174, 190). Yet some men, such as Burke, are wiser than their times; and when we compare the later Wordsworth with them we tend to read Mr. Todd's explanation of Wordsworth on reform (for instance) as the defence which his Introduction claims to avoid. The fact is that Wordsworth's contact with politics in his later years produced neither great poetry nor profound political wisdom; and what else should we look for in a study which carries Mr. Todd's title?

W. J. B. OWEN

¹ *Correspondence . . . with the Wordsworth Circle*, ed. Morley (Oxford, 1927), pp. 153-4.

The Correspondence of Arthur Hugh Clough. Edited by FREDERICK L. MULHAUSER. Vol. I, pp. xxiv+320; Vol. II, pp. vi+321-656. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957. £5. 5s. net.

America was kind to Clough at the very lowest ebb of his fortunes, when even the Antipodes had rejected so fastidious a sceptic. New England could not reward him, as it did Thackeray, with thumping lecture fees; but it gave him both personal and literary recognition and made him feel 'wanted'. It is fitting that the definitive Oxford edition of the *Poems* should be a product of Anglo-American co-operation, and that an American scholar should now have carried through the laborious task of ordering and assembling rather more than a quarter of the vast bulk of the surviving Clough papers. For so much new material made available in a clean economical text, for the valuable checklist of letters and clear signposting of what is not included here, students of Clough and his period will remain permanently in Professor Mulhauser's debt.

In some ways the very austerity of this edition, which is a monument of editorial self-denial, may seem appropriate to the spartan living and innate modesty of its subject. The practical reasons for the shape and style of these two volumes, and the principles governing selection, are firmly stated in the preface—the most curious reader, genuinely grateful for what he has got, may hardly quarrel with them. Yet any selection is a compromise, and nothing can be more irritating than the three dots that mark an omission in the text. This *Correspondence*, though it splendidly enlarges the range of letters in Mrs. Clough's *Prose Remains*, does not supersede that volume. The discretions and minor mysteries of Mrs. Clough's editing are for the most part cleared up, and (as with the full text of the poems) there is a special interest in noting which touches in the portrait Victorian sensibilities expunged or toned down. Yet to the *Prose Remains* the student must still return, not only for the Memoir with its valuable hints about Clough's American childhood, the miscellaneous prose pieces, and the rather flat travel letters from Greece and the Near East, but also for a number of essential links the present editor could not find room for. (The letter to J. C. Shairp of 16 March 1848, for example, in this edition lacks the key sentence: 'If it were not for all these blessed revolutions, I should sink into hopeless lethargy'; and the Paris *émeute* letters to Stanley which were the first-fruits of Clough's new response to the political stirring in Europe, shorn of the vivid French headlines and *mots*, lose much of their verve.) A graver loss to these volumes is that of Matthew Arnold's letters to Clough: Dr. Mulhauser stoically refers the reader to Dr. Lowry's separate edition, but without the Arnold letters his own pantheon lacks its noblest pillar.

In compensation, the admirable Emerson letters are here in full: after Arnold, Emerson was probably the friend who came nearest to being linked to Clough 'by intellectual bonds—the strongest of all'. We are given a much fuller documentation than we have yet had of the Rugby and Oxford years. Clough's high-minded exchanges with such grave Rugby seniors as Gell and Simpkinson are strikingly expanded, and the much-quoted sentence to the latter ('I verily believe my whole being is regularly soaked through with the wishing and hoping and

striving to do the School good') looks rather different when it is seen to follow upon excuses for avoiding the contaminating company of the no doubt delinquent young Henry Walrond. At Oxford, W. G. Ward makes a volcanic appearance—his fierce emotional dependence on his favourite pupil went far beyond what all other accounts have suggested. The whole of the prolonged Oriel correspondence with Provost Hawkins about Clough's resignation is included: this was an exchange from which that humourless champion of the Thirty-nine Articles emerges with a good deal of credit, and where even Dr. Mulhauser cannot acquit Clough of much shadow-boxing and some disingenuousness. The dismal University Hall phase is covered by the chief (but not the harshest) relevant documents.¹ We miss, however, some of Clough's distracted and distracting moods when he was emerging from the miasmal mists of Gordon Square early in 1852: most notably, perhaps, his reflections to his fiancée on the superiority of the single life as 'being more painful', the 'relish of chivalry' he had found in 'the Sydney project'; the important letter to Miss Smith quoting *Dipsychus* given in *Prose Remains* as of March; the key summary of 'the objects of life' in April, followed by the odd 'Romanizing frame of mind' and the perhaps significant variant in the *Dipsychus* quotation; finally, that account of the long ride from Rugby to Naseby, led by 'Shairp on his hunter, the pride of his heart', that is to be cherished as one of the last of Clough's outdoor athletic appearances.

Where the editor has allowed himself fullest scope is on the American expedition of 1852-3, in the correspondence relating to Clough's plans for marriage, and in supporting letters showing the wide range of his activities in his last years. Whether Clough's stay in America was really 'a happy time for him' may be doubted: his irony was not reserved for European capitals. Yet it was stimulating, between the intervals of conscientious drudgery on Plutarch, and a mass of circumstantial detail is now added to the diary record he kept for his fiancée. Dr. Mulhauser's transatlantic gallantry towards Miss Smith may not be shared by all his readers. When Clough, in that drier eighteenth-century manner we could wish he had used more often, incautiously writes: 'Mrs. Howe dresses so low that I'm always in terror lest she should come up bodily out of it, like a pencil out of a case', he feels obliged to add hastily, 'Don't be shocked, Blanche dear.' The 'very good child' at Combe Hurst, the *douce et paisible*, had traits of Georgina as well as of Mary Trevellyn. Clough (faithful to Adam's resolve, 'No, and I don't tell Eve') had already warned her against reading *Dipsychus*; but one of the most piquant situations these letters reveal is that of Miss Smith hovering guiltily over the Pandora's box that contained this dangerous manuscript, succumbing, and then writing her agonizing reappraisal of 'those peeps and reminders of your old times and thoughts'. Clough's reaction to this, as to other sermons in a like mode, was incoherent, polite, but unmistakable: he came as near as he could do to breaking off the engagement.

Apart from a few of those brief critical *aperçus*—notably on Tennyson, Whitman, and Arnold himself—to which Matthew Arnold attached such value, there is less direct comment on poetry than might have been expected. An early

¹ See G. P. Johari, 'Arthur Hugh Clough at Oriel and at University Hall', *P.M.L.A.*, lxxvi (1951), 405-25.

exchange with Gell (Letters 49 and 51 of this edition) is suggestive, since it provoked the latter into a 'treatise on the publication of private feelings in poetry' that points on towards Philip Hewson in *The Bothie*. The sudden impulse that produced *The Bothie* has always been something of a mystery: it looks now as if Shairp may unconsciously have played a role as begetter; his letter to Clough (182), probably received in Liverpool in August 1848, cites the familiar Arnoldian classroom illustration of the Thucydidean night-battle that was to provide a central image for Philip Hewson's dilemma, and ends with an affectionate recalling of the benediction, $\delta \theta ε ο ς μ ε τ à σ ο υ$, which Clough had used the year before as the refrain of his first 'Highland lassie' verses. Clough's rueful vexation at his original unlucky title for *The Bothie* is at last fully printed in the letter (209) to Tom Arnold: here surely the most restrained of editors might have allowed himself a footnote.¹ It may not be fanciful to discover a hint of the imagery of 'Say not the struggle nought availeth' (written at Rome in 1849) in the letter (202) received earlier that year from C. E. Pritchard.

Of Clough's longer poems, *Amours de Voyage* comes most into discussion in his correspondence. It is a matter for lasting regret that none of his contemporaries seems to have been able to grasp what Clough was trying to do in this subtle and delicately shaded study of the horror, the boredom, and the glory of mid-nineteenth-century Europe. Clough defended his conception confidently enough to the 'rosewaterish sentimental' Shairp, but Matthew Arnold's indifference undoubtedly hurt; when the poem was finally revised and published in America, even such friendly and experienced judges as Lowell, Norton, Child, and Emerson continued to miss the real point. It was not until some years after Clough's death that anything approaching an adequate appreciation of the *Amours* was made:² later readers, educated by Henry James and Prufrock, have had less difficulty in recognizing in it Clough's most balanced and accomplished work. On *Dipsychus*, as on *Easter Day* (except for a characteristic request for a copy from Monckton Milnes), these letters are silent. Clough's laconic comments on the poems gathered by Norton for the proposed American collection are unrevealing.

'Clough's letters', Dr. Mulhauser notes in his temperate but deeply understanding Introduction, 'are letters of statement rather than letters of confession.' That is why the biography recorded here—though responsive to many of the profoundest mental and social stresses of the time—is so largely external; for the inner life and its deeper undercurrents we must search in the poetry. Clough could not tell Ward what he felt, but he could write something of it later in *Qua Cursum Ventus*. Whenever a correspondent—J. A. Froude, F. W. Newman, the irrepressible Margaret Fuller, even Stanley or Matthew Arnold—grows emotional, Clough dries up. He is constrained throughout with his sister, and seems completely at ease only with Burbidge, Shairp, Tom Arnold, Norton, and—

¹ 'Baird's well', which was what the Loch Ericht boatman gave Clough as a rendering of his *Toper-na-Fuosich*, seems undoubtedly to be a version of the ribald Gaelic toast, *Tobar na Feusaig(e)*. Cf. note on the title in the Oxford 1951 edition of the *Poems*, p. 497; the point was made in an early review in the *Literary Gazette*, 18 Aug. 1849. (I owe this last reference to an unpublished thesis on Clough by Miss Joan Brewster, London University Library.)

² In the *Westminster Review*, Oct. 1869.

rather surprisingly—Carlyle: the Carlyle exchanges are perhaps the most purely delightful *trouvaille* in this collection. Dr. Mulhauser points clearly to the two periods in Clough's life we should most like to understand: the years 1839–40 and 1849–51. These volumes are helpful on the first; less helpful on the second, to which Clough's truest poetry belongs. It is clear that for him, as for Housman, poetry was a morbid secretion; and a reading of these letters certainly confirms the view of his latest and most sympathetic biographer,¹ that by helping to make him comfortable Mrs. Clough finally killed her husband's muse. What is surely to be hoped, now that a reliable text of the poems has been supplemented by this authentic record of a life that still has power to move us, is that future studies of Clough may be directed less to the 'failure' we have all heard too much about, and more to a rare and distinctive Victorian achievement.

JAMES BERTRAM

A Critical Guide to *Leaves of Grass*. By JAMES E. MILLER, JR. Pp. xii + 268. Chicago: University Press; London: Cambridge University Press, 1957. 45s. net.

Whitman once wrote of the 'curious chess game of a poem' and Mr. Miller's book is a history and an explanation of various moves the poet made which are confusing to the reader of *Leaves of Grass*. Mr. Miller establishes a chess-board for us and identifies the symbolism, the details of images, and the linkage of themes within which Whitman has so often been regarded as formless, and in so doing he establishes the order, the dramatic order, underlying *Leaves of Grass*. He also adds to our understanding of Whitman's intentions. He begins with a series of analyses of the dramatic structure of some of the poems and sections of *Leaves of Grass* which he considers the finest and most appealing. The selection of these poems is a matter of personal taste, and Mr. Miller's general criticism of Whitman's work may perhaps have suffered to a small degree by his desire to respond—and most convincingly so—to the challenge presented by such poems as 'Song of Myself' which is generally considered chaotically organized, 'held together', as Mr. Miller says, 'if at all, by the robust personality of Walt Whitman'. Mr. Miller does manage to take the lid off the container of multitudes; he is not afraid of larger contradictions; and he is able to regard and explain this poem as an inverted mystical experience.

There is a clever treatment of the myth in 'Children of Adam', but the discussion of 'Calamus' is not wholly satisfactory. Romantic friendship between men of the nineteenth century often either embarrasses contemporary critics or is hastily ascribed to abnormality. Mr. Miller argues that Whitman intended 'the tokens of amative love' in 'Calamus' to be but symbols and rebuts Mark Van Doren's questioning of Whitman's democratic dogmas as being based in 'abnormal' love: arguments cannot completely undo the effect of the Freudian fruit of the tree of sex knowledge, however much an innocent reader might desire to 'associate with spiritual love the intensity and personal passion of traditional romantic attachment'. The expositions of 'Brooklyn Ferry' and the 'Broad-Axe'

¹ Miss Frances J. Woodward, in *The Doctor's Disciples* (Oxford, 1954).

are more obvious, and less critically useful than the chapters dealing with the 'Rocking Cradle', 'Lilacs', and 'India'. The first section concludes with a chapter on the shorter poems, which discusses Whitman's use of the catalogue, his poetic techniques in such vignettes as the 'Dalliance of the Eagles', 'Sparkles from the Wheel', or 'A Noiseless Patient Spider'. There is excellent criticism of 'Vigil Strange I Kept on the Field One Night', an unduly neglected poem.

In the second part of his book Mr. Miller comes to grips with the problem or problems caused by the structure of *Leaves of Grass*. The metaphors used by other critics, even that suggested by Whitman himself in his title, are shown to be unsatisfactory. The poems cannot be satisfactorily described in terms of a building, the Bible, music, a journey, a man. There have been earlier analyses of *Leaves of Grass*, those of William Sloane Kennedy and Irving C. Strong. Mr. Miller bases his upon an examination of the book's major thematic patterns, and sees the work as falling into three main groups: the biographical experiences demarcating these groups occur at the outbreak of the Civil War (1861) and the onset of Whitman's paralysis (1873). This division is not altered but is rather supported by Whitman's integration of fresh material in successive editions. The first group of poems, then, is seen as a 'skeleton of Personality'—'One's Self'; the second deals with 'this *Time & Land we swim in*'; the third involves the self with the law of spirituality. Mr. Miller further sees the movement of the book as supplied with an introduction in 'Inscription' and 'Starting from Paumanok' and closed with a review of themes in 'Thou Mother with Thy Equal Brood', 'From Noon to Starry Night', and 'Songs of Parting', with, as afterthoughts, the Annexes. The poems are not completely, in his analysis of their structural organization, linked by themes, since their imagery is also useful in giving them unity. Some themes, also, are implicit rather than explicit, yet provide the poetry with what Mr. Miller terms submerged foundations.

From chapters 13 to 17 Mr. Miller illustrates his analysis by quotation and explanation of the significance of various passages. He contrives to add to our understanding of the book's structure in so doing, and makes us the more ready to accept Whitman's own comment that his poems 'when complete, should be a *unity*'. Science, democracy, and religion were his myths, and those of his contemporaries, and Mr. Miller shows us how Whitman attempted to fuse them into an epic structure which would represent the beliefs and attitudes of a nineteenth-century America exuberantly independent, then tested in the crucible of civil war, and, after it, pursuing inevitable progress, still looking forward to fruition, even in death.

A. NORMAN JEFFARES

Anatomy of Criticism. Four Essays. By NORTHROP FRYE. Pp. x+384. Princeton: University Press; London: Oxford University Press, 1957. 48s. net.

For this extraordinary book, as for how few works of critical theory, one confidently predicts long life. It is wonderfully well written, and has such momentum that to disagree with it is almost physically painful, though very necessary. It has almost no repose, but makes up for that by being full of that seemingly inevitable

wit that comes only of great intelligence—a little, if one seeks a comparison, like Shaw. And somewhere hidden, driving the book along, is a demon every bit as queer as metabiology. Only by standards which Professor Frye would not accept does it fall short of greatness in its kind: first, if it were widely accepted it would have no influence upon the course of literature itself, and the highest criticism has; secondly, it fails, or refuses, to convey anything of what might be called the personal presence of any of the thousands of works discussed.

The reason for these shortcomings is not the author's incapacity but his devotion to duty. He deals with literature in terms of a specific conceptual framework derived from an inductive study of literature, hoping thus to avoid the 'fallacy of determinism' exhibited in Freudian or Marxist criticism; and he is therefore conscious of his descent from Aristotle, as well as of the analogies between his critical method and the sciences, particularly physics in its mathematical phase. Literature he treats as a second nature, vast, inexhaustible, and anonymous; as physics studies nature, criticism studies art. But if it is to be a progressive science like physics, criticism needs to be developed systematically; that this has never been done is most easily seen from the fantastic deficiency of the critical vocabulary, a deficiency which the author labours fantastically to supply. As literature grew more and more complex, critical systematization declined, whereas the primitive formulations of physics gave way to complex mathematical symbolism. Instead of concluding, as I should, that the physics-criticism analogy breaks down here, Mr. Frye proceeds to invent a quasi-mathematical critical system. But if science and art are alike Symbolic Forms (which Mr. Frye at least in part believes) a criticism which objectifies art is a strange parasite, as if one were to invent a non-mathematical way of presenting mathematics. However, the author is committed to finding some central hypothesis which will allow one to treat criticism as totally coherent, and concerned with the phenomena of art as parts of a whole; to do for criticism what Darwin did for biology. Of the prescientific prejudices which have first to be exploded, two stand out: first, the 'fallacy of premature teleology'—the notion that the critic's task is to get out of a work what the author put in, which corresponds, in the natural sciences, to the belief that a phenomenon is as it is because Providence inscrutably made it so. Secondly, value-judgements must go; the assault on them is very lively, but Mr. Frye admits that Milton is a more valuable poet than Blackmore, a fatal concession one would have thought, since it is not nobler to study stars than worms.

Between the Polemical Introduction (which is all I have so far considered) and the Tentative Conclusion stand the four enormous essays which chart and classify the world of literature. It is like some strange unknown forest, where the trees grow in groups of four, five, six, or seven, and which is divided into four sections, with balancing subsections, the numerological groups constantly re-echoing each other; ultimately the author reaches the heart of the wood, and finds what he knew was there, a central myth, inconceivably diversified throughout the body of literature. I have tried but failed to find some way of abridging the scheme of these essays, and in what follows there is much distortion as well as omission. I have also emphasized the points which seem to me to show the degree to which

this book suffers, in its own way, from the fallacy of determinism; this being so it is only fair to repeat at this point that the text is often brilliant with wit and penetrating in observation.

The First Essay (*Historical Criticism: Theory of Modes*) classifies fictions by the degree to which their heroes are *spoudaios* or *phaulos*. (Mr. Frye, in the modern American manner, transliterates all his Greek.) This yields five 'modes' of fiction, stretching from the hero as god to the hero as the reader's inferior (irony). European fiction has gravitated from the first to the last of these modes, from myth to romance, to tragedy and epic (the 'high mimetic' modes), and to comedy and irony ('low mimetic' modes). In each mode there is to be distinguished a 'naïve' and a 'sentimental' form (these terms are not used in their normal, nor yet quite in Schiller's, sense, but a glossary is provided, very necessary if one remembers that the class of hero called *alazon* includes Madame Bovary, Lord Jim, Heathcliff, and Othello, whereas the *pharmakos* class includes Hester Prynne, Billy Budd, Tess, and, one supposes, Mr. Waugh's heroes. This is very exercising. Who is the *alazon* in *Emma*, Mr. Elton or Emma herself? Is Lucky Jim an *alazon* or a *pharmakos* or possibly an *eiron*? Is he comic or ironic?) Frye goes on to study the tragic and comic modes systematically, as demonstrating the tension between *mimesis* and *mythos*; in relation to the latter, the question to ask about *Tom Jones* or *Oliver Twist* is what are their relations with the birth-mystery plots of Menander, and with myths like those of Moses and Perseus.

The most valuable part of this First Essay deals with 'Thematic Modes' and is a sort of extension of the Aristotelian *dianoia*. This is concerned not with the question 'How is this story going to turn out?', which relates to plot, and specifically to *anagnorisis*; but with the question 'What's the point of this story?' No work of fiction is totally fictional, none is totally thematic; but any work can have a bias one way or the other, as titles like *The History of Tom Jones* and *Sense and Sensibility* indicate. As in fiction the author imposes mythical form on life, so in 'thematic' writing he imposes literary form on thought. He does not *imitate* thought; to suppose that he does is to risk the fallacy of 'existential projection'—arguing back from the poem's theme to the poet's thought. The 'thought' that all thematic poetry projects—as Spenser projects Platonism and Goethe 'organicism'—is not the poet's 'philosophy'; and this is true whether this thought is theologically or philosophically conventional or self-generated, as in Blake or Shelley. In placing this 'as if' before all poetic 'thought', Frye is as true to the broadly Symbolist view of literature as he was in declaring all works of art to be anonymous, placing precisely the same difficulties of interpretation before their own authors as they do before independent critics.

Even from this very inadequate account it should be clear that the book is deeply concerned with mythical and thematic recurrence in literature, and hence with the schematization of the multitudinous ways in which the recurrent may be embodied. The Second Essay, which is called *Ethical Criticism: Theory of Symbols*, assumes as a fact of literary experience the principle of 'polysemous meaning', adopts the four-level Dantesque system of interpretation (though denying that one level is more valuable than another) and seeks not a sequence of meanings so much as of contexts in which the work of art can be placed, each context having its own *dianoia*, *mythos*, and *ethos*.

Literary meaning is always 'hypothetical' or 'imaginative'; questions of fact or truth are subordinate to the primary aim of producing a structure of words for its own sake. Wherever we have an autonomous verbal structure of this kind we have literature. (This is again Symbolist; by 'hypothetical' Frye means what Mrs. Langer means by 'virtual', and this is not far, though the approach is so different, from I. A. Richards's 'pseudo-'. Indeed, this passage is a conspicuous clue to where we are going; for not only is 'autonomy' a reverend Symbolist concept, but the assertion of the discontinuity of literature from assertive thinking supports the parallel with mathematics, and suggests allegiance to the latest manifestation of Symbolist aesthetics, the neo-Kantianism of Cassirer's Symbolic Forms. Thus, what is called 'discursive thinking' is ruinous to literature because it interferes with its 'centripetality': this is so whether the thought is of God or how to grow hops. I find some confusion in the argument here because I do not see why the poet, who can say so much without affirming anything, must be held to have chosen 'centrifugal material' if he speaks of theology, simply because theology can be called tautological, whereas he can use jokes and puns and even myths which have not been existentially projected into dogma. Behind all this is the old Symbolist regret that words are used for other purposes than to make poems.) A consequence of this principle of autonomy is that the medieval 'literal' acquires a new sense; since a poem cannot be literally anything but a poem, what Dante thought of as the 'literal' meaning is in fact an 'allegorical' meaning, though a simple prose paraphrase. (This is attractive, because it removes the ground of the quarrel between those who contend, with Mr. Winters, that any good poem must have a paraphrasable meaning, and those who anathematize paraphrase; for Mr. Frye they are simply talking about two different phases of the poem's existence. The 'literal' meaning, in his sense, is nearly what Professor Wilson Knight calls the 'spatial' interpretation. We listen to the poem, but we *see* what it means; we have a simultaneous apprehension of the whole, towards which all the words point, inwards. This 'hypothetical verbal structure' is the literal meaning. Frye duly acknowledges that nobody before Mallarmé could have supposed this. From it follow a number of familiar consequences; thought in a poem is 'virtual thinking', the intention of the poet is only what is definitively described in his text, poetry is always ironical because it never means what it says. Nor, in the nature of the case, is there any possible limit to commentary; we can talk about a poem, as about a tulip, for ever, always *explicating* (see Hulme and Bergson), or, as Frye prefers to say, *allegorizing*).

But, if we must refrain from existential projections, there are nevertheless ways of talking about the work, however autonomous, in a context, the context of literary forms as a whole. On the assumption that 'literature shapes itself, and is not shaped externally', Frye proposes a new theory of genres. (Even here, though the author regrets that we are less clear about genre than Milton was when he sat down to write *Lycidas*, there is no escape from Symbolism. Frye will not allow that the poet is the 'father' of his poem; that would be to confuse a literary with a discursive verbal structure. He is only the midwife, or womb. This striking passage on p. 98 is, perhaps deliberately, an allegorization of Mallarmé's sonnet, 'Don du poème'.) In fact this is a theory of archetypes, mythic patterns inductively ascertained from a study of the *secunda natura*, art, regardless of whether the artist was conscious of employing them. These archetypes are so important to Frye's system that they must be distinguished from other hypotheses that go under the same name: they are not Jungian. They are a necessary corollary of the doctrine that the forms in which a poet organizes his work come out of poetry, not life. Their presence has

nothing to do with value, and Frye deliberately draws many examples from cheap and superficial literature. They are quite distinct from Miss Bodkin's archetypes, because Frye is concerned only with the fact of recurrence, though to explain that recurrence it is necessary to descend to the primitive mythical level of seasonal recurrence and rebirth. In fact the archetypes provide the link between literature and life which makes literature an ethical instrument 'without any temptation to dispose of the arts in the process'. As an ethical instrument, art is 'disinterested and liberal', proper to culture as distinct from civilization. Archetypes are therefore the agents which enable the fifth (or as Dante would have said, the fourth or anagogical) level of meaning; for at the heart of the archetypes there are 'universal symbols'. Literature, in this phase, becomes 'the total dream of man', not imitating but *containing* nature; and the poem is a microcosm, a monad containing life in a system of verbal relationships; it is the 'epiphany' of Joyce, the 'inscape' of Hopkins. (Frye knows well that this is Symbolist; like Pound, he identifies metaphor, one of these relationships, as juxtaposition without predicate, which is the ideographic version of the Romantic or Symbolist image. I cannot do justice to this second essay, but it is fair to say that its structure, however weird it looks, is a considerable intellectual achievement, being nothing less than the adaptation of an Aristotelian scheme to a Symbolist view of literature.)

The Third Essay (*Archetypal Criticism: Theory of Myths*) fully expounds the implications of these archetypes, and in doing so takes us to the heart of the wood, where we find the central hypothesis; it reminds one of Frazer's treatment of the sanctuary of Diana Nemorensis, except that Frazer puts this at the beginning of his book and Frye, appropriately since he holds that the Quest-romance underlies all literature, seeks it through strange landscapes. If one regards myth as one pole, and naturalism as the other, of literary design, a theory of *displacement* will account for the degree to which the mythical pattern is obscured, in any given work, by the demands of plausibility. Undisplaced myth is about gods and demons, heaven and hell, and may be divided into apocalyptic and demonic; at the other extreme realism plays down myth as far as possible. But the process is circular, and ironic literature, which starts from realism, tends to turn into undisplaced myth. (The circularity of Frye's diagrams is one aspect I have had to neglect. This passage on 'displacement' is both central and subtle, though it must be said that its main purpose is to lower the author into myth, where all the answers are ultimately to be found. It sometimes appears that the answers to all literary problems must at present be primitivistic, and this book is, under one aspect, an immense structure of primitivizing devices, extremely sophisticated.) A general Theory of Mythos, isolating seven types or categories of image, follows. Basically there are four pre-generic narrative elements in literature: Spring-Comedy, Summer-Romance, Autumn-Tragedy, Winter-Irony and Satire. Here, on the primitivistic bedrock, we find the cleverest and most sophisticated part of the book, far too complicated to summarize, abounding with brilliant critical observation, and a perfect riot of terminological innovation. (For example, the *ieron* type, otherwise the Vice or the Golux, includes Leporello, Jeeves, and Ariel; the *agroikos* Malvolio, Jacques, Bertram, Caliban, and Manly. Speaking of tragedy, Mr. Frye throws out the idea, new to me, that the two great periods of tragedy correspond to the rise of Ionian and Renaissance science, which may help us to understand his point that all tragedy leads up to 'an epiphany of law'.) The book seems to me particularly good on tragedy, which it treats as a part of a total quest-myth of which the other pre-generic mythoi are constituents. Tragedy is itself divided into six phases, of which

the last is set in a world of shock and horror (*Oedipus Tyrannus*), with central images of *sparagmos*; and this last phase shades into pure demonic epiphany (*Inferno*).

For all its brilliance, this essay does not pretend to take us very far, and having mastered it one is still left without an answer to very elementary questions. For example: everybody can see that *Othello*, *Otello*, and Cinthio's bloody little story are very different (even if we leave out of consideration that two of the works are sublime masterpieces and the third not) but so far Frye has only taught us clever ways of saying how they resemble each other; for his account of the position of *Othello* in the world of literature will serve without alteration for the other two works also. The Fourth Essay (*Rhetorical Criticism: Theory of Genres*), though abstaining from judgements of value, provides some criteria for making the necessary distinctions.

It opens with a flurry of triads, stemming from Aristotle's *melos*, *lexis*, and *opsis*, but settles down to a study of the *radical of presentation* as the differentia of genre (the radical of *epos*, as opposed to epic, is oral address; of *fiction*, the printed address to the reader. These two genres are flanked by drama and lyric.) In connexion with *epos*, Frye studies the rhythm of oral verse, and finds the four-stress line to be inherent in the structure of English. Considering *melos*, he defines 'musical poetry' as poetry resembling the music contemporary with it, and having a predominating stress accent with free variation of the number of syllables between stresses. (Browning is a musical poet, Tennyson not.) *Opsis* is considered as imitative harmony, and the palm for this goes to Spenser, which is no odder than many other things in this chapter, of which space absolutely forbids me to say more.

In his *Tentative Conclusion* the author insists on the utility of 'archetypal criticism' in breaking down the barriers between different critical methods. The mythic core of literature invites infinite explanation and allegorization; but so long as this effort is confined to individual works, we have chaos, as in *Hamlet* criticism. Archetypal criticism ends chaos, because 'things become more hopeful as soon as there is a feeling . . . that criticism has an end in the structure of literature as a total form, as well as a beginning in the text studied'. But this is not all; Frye now sets his theory in a wider context. He rejects as fallacious all doctrines of cultural decline, but equally rejects all possibility of development in the arts; the best that can be done has already been done, though it may be repeated. What can be steadily improved is the understanding of the arts; and so the critic's task is associated with the ultimate purposes of civilization. In this way art, though without morality, is an ethical instrument, neo-Arnoldian and with a quite different interpretation of *spoudaios*. Finally, the analogy between criticism and mathematics becomes explicit. Literature and mathematics proceed not from facts but from postulates; both can be applied to external reality and yet also exist in a 'pure' form, &c. For Plato, the ultimate acts of apprehension were mythical or mathematical, and Frye says much the same thing. To remake the broken links between creation and knowledge, art and science, myth and concept—which Frye conceives to be the work of criticism—is, in the end, an attempt to understand that art is a symbolic form, like language, myth, and science. Once more we are in the domain of Cassirer; for all his immense originality, Frye is in some ways a less original critic than, say, Mr. Yvor Winters.

I have indicated in passing some of the elements of what may intelligibly be

called 'Symbolist' doctrine in this book, and they add up to a total impressive enough to indicate that its author wrote it with much less freedom from prejudice than he supposed. A poem is an anonymous and autonomous verbal structure; literal meaning cannot be rendered in other words; literary form is spatial; the intention is defined in the text. Add to these beliefs a highly developed organicism, a primitivism which arrives at myth through archetype and, though rejecting the hypothesis of Mr. Barfield, accepts those of Cassirer and Mrs. Langer; and you have the latest, extraordinary development of Symbolist criticism. Perhaps the need for mythology has never been so richly expressed; yet this, like any other 'sentimental' revival of myth, is an ironical comment on the society which calls for it. I myself believe, with Mr. Forster, that one may 'introduce mysticism at the wrong stage of the affair'; for example, the doctrine of anonymity is a mystical doctrine, which serves to explain why St. John of the Cross or Dante were no better than they were at interpreting their own poems, but does not explain how severe must be the technical process by which Proust or Mr. Eliot or Mr. Forster reproduce, with eyes wide open, the relation between what Mr. Frye calls *Augenblick* and the ordinary business of living. It is very unfortunate that he has not yet allowed himself to study, in terms of his diagram, one single work of art.

Everything in the book points downwards, to preconscious ritual, which is the necessary base of the structure. Mr. Frye's primitivism differs from that of less literary aestheticians in two ways: first, he is enormously well acquainted with literature; secondly, he is fascinated by ornamental design. The book sometimes looks like the work of an apocalyptic numerologist with a flair for Greek, and its threes, fours, fives, sixes, and sevens have a curiously *centripetal* effect; so has its general design, in which one can detect a *peripeteia* and finally, in the confrontation of mathematics by literature, a *cognitio*. If I were allowed to be diagrammatic, I should call *Anatomy of Criticism* a work of sixth-phase Symbolism placed on the frontier of a purer Aristotelianism. Certainly it would be reasonable to treat this as a work of criticism which has turned into literature, for it is centripetal, autonomous, and ethical without, I think, being useful. As literature it has, if I may be permitted to say so, great value; and if this judgement seems to lack support in what I have said, I am perfectly content that this notice be regarded as a hideous example of *sparagmos*.

FRANK KERMODE

Eras and Modes in English Poetry. By JOSEPHINE MILES. Pp. xii+234. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press; London: Cambridge University Press, 1957. 30s. net.

This is a refreshingly condensed book, and it should do much to aid the study of literary history. It is not an easy book to read, but it is packed tight with stimulating ideas, critical theory, and interpretations; it does much to provoke thought about the problem of periods of literature, of style, and of achievement. Professor Miles begins with a chapter on eras and modes in English poetry. She uses sentence structure as her guide to the distinctions between different kinds

of poetry which correspond to periods of literary history. In doing so she creates fresh awareness of the pattern of tradition as well as of development. Her divisions are threefold: the phrasal type of sentence which is cumulative in effect, using adjectives and nouns preponderantly; the clausal which is discursive using predicates in plenty, and subordinate verbs in relative and adverbial clauses; and the balanced which uses both clausal and phrasal elements. Dr. Miles is well aware of the dangers of over-simplification but she is able to relate our tentative feelings about poetic periods, about those early, middle, and late divisions of the various centuries' poetry to a more precise partitioning of poets by means of her treble category of modes.

Her second chapter, on the language of the Donne tradition, places Donne's work firmly within English poetry of the Renaissance, powerful in primary language, predicative, and full of action and evaluation. This method of dealing with Donne makes it possible to show how unlike Donne's work is that of T. S. Eliot, which uses nouns and adjectives where the Donne tradition, ranging from Chaucer to Browning, uses verbs. This is poetry which belongs to colloquial speech, to human relationships, and to the process of thought.

On Dryden and the classical mode, Dr. Miles offers pertinent comment. She is able to locate Jonson's work precisely in relation to the classical tradition and sees Dryden as placed on the isthmus of a middle state between Jonson's and Milton's extremes. This is an excellent chapter, with useful comparisons drawn between Dryden's technique and that of Horace.

The chapters on the sublime poem and the sublimity of William Blake are full of suggestions which add to our understanding of eighteenth-century poetry. The remarks on Southey and Campbell are particularly useful; Blake is treated as both conventional eighteenth-century poet and innovator. The proportion of 'four adjectives and nouns to one verb in a line of verse' leads to the critic's conclusion that there cannot be much play of subordination or of reasoning in this poetry. Phrases rather than clauses became Blake's units of expression, and he, like many poets from Pope to Campbell, blends, as Dr. Miles puts it, scenic, anatomical, and emotional terms with a sense of vast force and portent. In this chapter we are brought back to the facts of history, and the correspondence between the ideas of Pope and Blake is skilfully shown: social and emotional comment, tempestuous scenes, tyranny, innocence did not first come into being as poetic subjects at the whim of the revolutionists at the end of the century, nor was Wesley their sole begetter in the beginning of it. The contrast between the neo-classical youth of the eighteenth century and the child, the oppressed Biblical child, of Blake is neatly made.

The chapters on the ballad, on the romantic mode, and on Wordsworth are excellent literary history. The classical balance Wordsworth achieved is given depth, and Dr. Miles's critical power is at its best when evaluating that depth's merits for modern readers: 'In its harmonious regularity and cumulative stress it demands meditation; in its accords, sympathy; in its balanced literalness, a steady observation.'

The late-nineteenth-century classical mode is examined in chapter ix. This chapter suffers slightly from much quotation of other scholars and critics, and

is less tightly packed with informative theories or descriptions; the next chapters on Hopkins and Yeats are intended to exemplify the classical 'middle distance' which the last century and this have re-created in their poetry. The chapter on Hopkins stresses his use of epithet and suggests sensible modification in the dicta of some subjective approaches to Hopkins; that on Yeats is a little disjointed. When Dr. Miles remarks that Yeats was praising the classical in history as he began to write it in his verse it might have added greatly to her argument to say that he was then also reading many of the classical English poets for the first time.

There is a final chapter by way of summary and conclusion, on the resources of language, as well as two appendixes, one on proportions, measures, and vocabularies of poets, 1500-1940, and one on words most used by ten poets. Several misprints are misleading, and in one or two chapters the reader becomes aware that he is reading material designed originally for some scholarly journal and not completely integrated into the text of the book. This is perhaps the reason that there is some unnecessary repetition of the definition of critical terms. These entirely minor points aside, the book is most stimulating, a penetrating piece of scholarly criticism.

A. NORMAN JEFFARES

Papers in Linguistics, 1934-1951. By J. R. FIRTH. Pp. xii+234. London: Oxford University Press, 1957. 35s. net.

These papers, which treat mainly of the techniques of descriptive linguistics and their application in practice, are markedly stamped with their author's very forcible personality—a fact which will give them a peculiarly stimulating flavour to many, while for the same reason they will at times seem irritating, through their frequent tendency to a kind of confident solipsisticity, to others. They are designed to show the development of Professor Firth's own 'London School of Linguistics', in view of the emphatic guiding influence and pioneering force he has exerted at the London University School of Oriental and African Studies during his long connexion with it, and especially during his distinguished tenure of its Chair of Linguistics which was the first to be established in Great Britain.

These papers fall roughly into three divisions: those treating of linguistic theory and practice in general, those in which linguistic matters directly pertaining to English are closely examined, and those in which their author's ideas and techniques are specifically applied to Asiatic languages. A review here, therefore, must deal mainly with the second of these divisions, though some papers of a general character naturally include matters that are of interest to the student of the English language, and will accordingly be touched upon, but lightly.

The tone of this collection is set by a passage in Professor Firth's Introduction:

Words stare you in the face from the text, and that is enough; and as Wittgenstein said, a word in company may be said to have a physiognomy. The elements of style can be stated in linguistic terms.

Most of these papers are reprinted from learned journals: and it is very convenient now to have them collected together in an ordered progression.

Of the papers on matters of general linguistics, the three from the *Transactions of the Philological Society* are of the greatest interest, as they together provide a clear picture of their author's highly individual and influential approach to the whole field. They treat of 'The Technique of Semantics' (1935), 'Sounds and Prosodies' (1948), and 'General Linguistics and Descriptive Grammar' (1951), and well show the development of those qualities which Mr. Firth has made the distinctive features of his 'London School'.

'The Technique of Semantics' is most notable for its first clear expression of that valuable approach to the whole complex of meaning which later has come to be known as the *Spectrum*. The position is summarized thus (p. 33):

Meaning, then, we use for the whole complex of functions which a linguistic form may have. The principal components of this whole meaning are phonetic function, which I call 'minor' function, the major functions—lexical, morphological and syntactical (to be the province of a reformed system of grammar), and the function of a complete locution in the context of situation, or typical context of situation, the province of semantics.

The concluding wish for a dictionary of linguistic terminology has now been in part answered by Dr. Eric Hamp's *American Glossary*:¹ but any effective work of this sort would seem to demand a moratorium in the invention of new terms and of new meanings for those already established.

'Sounds and Prosodies' is chiefly notable for the formulation of that extended use of the ancient term *prosody* invented by Firth, which, like his all-embracing use of the term *meaning*, has proved both stimulating and bewildering to students. In introducing the new technical usage he writes (p. 123):

I am now submitting a system of ideas on word structure, especially emphasizing the convenience of stating word structure and its musical attributes as distinct orders of abstractions from the total phonological complex. Such abstractions I refer to as prosodies.

On the earlier history of this new-old term in linguistics Professor Daniel Jones has briefly given the facts in his admirable essay on *The History and Meaning of the term Phoneme* (p. 13).²

The paper on 'General Linguistics and Descriptive Grammar', basing itself on Sweet's belief in 'living philology' and his view that the originality of English linguistic scholarship lies in phonology and dialectology, and setting out the proper basic methods for the construction of a descriptive grammar, will be found acceptable and stimulating by all concerned. The approach is neither 'mentalist' nor 'mechanist', but bases itself on the 'whole man in his patterns of living': and an outstanding weakness of much American linguistics is well touched upon (p. 219):

They find it convenient to apply Behaviourist phonetics and mathematical phonemics to language events, but cannot find a parallel Behaviourist brand of semantics.

¹ *A Glossary of American Technical Linguistic Usage*, compiled for the Permanent International Committee of Linguists (Utrecht/Antwerp, 1957).

² Published for the I.P.A. by the Department of Phonetics, University College, London, 1957.

And again (p. 220):

Language text must be attributed to participants in some context of situation in order that its modes of meaning may be stated at a series of levels, which taken together form a sort of linguistic spectrum.

The most permanently valuable paper in the book is that entitled 'Modes of Meaning' first published in the English Association's annual volume of *Essays and Studies* for 1951: and since this discusses meaning with mainly English illustrations, it may serve as a bridge to the more specifically English aspects of this volume. Here the Firthian concept of meaning as embracing every variety of 'levels' in its 'spectrum' is most fully and agreeably worked out and illustrated by a study of such examples of peculiarly English 'prosodies' as those of the *Jabberwocky* lines and some of Swinburne's more rhythmic and musical but less meaningful (in the ordinary sense) poems. Here rhythms and rhymes and the music of English word-structures may be quite 'meaningful' though their content is quite untranslatable.

In 'The Garden of Proserpine' a great deal of the meaning is stated by making use of what I have called the lower or simpler modes at the phonetic, prosodic, grammatical, and collocational levels:

and 'Swinburne is the most "phonetic" of all English poets' (p. 197). This essay, besides its contribution to the war for the definition of meaning, is a most valuable literary and aesthetic study by implication.

Of the two papers which deal specifically with English, that on 'The English School of Phonetics' will be found by far the more interesting, since it touches on some of the historical facts often overlooked, and does this often with grace and liveliness. A kind of 'continuity' in approach to linguistic matters is shown, from Ælfric's *Latin Grammar* to Daniel Jones and Firth himself. Many of its details, since the historical standpoint is inevitably that of the keen amateur, are a little inexact; and a study of the material for the seventeenth century in Professor R. F. Jones's important volume would have improved the perspective for that period, had revision formed part of the plan of this book.¹ This is only one illustration of the fact that a good deal is inevitably out of date in several of these papers which could have been adjusted in revision, had it not been decided to reprint them unchanged from their original periodical form. Particularly inadequate is the appreciation of John Wallis, whose essay on speech (*De Loquela, Tractatus grammatico-physicus*) prefixed to his *Grammatica linguae anglicanae* (1653) is a fundamental document for the beginnings of English phonetics. In a definitely pioneering way it combines some of the traditional 'literal' phonetics with physiology and the results of first-hand practical observation.

The other specifically English paper deals with 'The Use and Distribution of Certain English Sounds'. This is valuable chiefly for its insistence on the

¹ Richard Foster Jones, *The Triumph of the English Language* (Stamford, 1952). For more scientific information cf. Otto Funke, *Die Frühzeit der englischen Grammatik* (Berne, 1941); and Ivan Poldauf, *On the History of some Problems of English Grammar before 1800* (Prague, 1948).

importance of always considering every sound and phoneme in its actual context:

The progressive contextualization of linguistic facts in this way places them in actual working conditions or use, rather than in systems, and therefore establishes what I would call their 'major' function. (p. 36)

A good deal has been done since 1935, when this essay appeared in *English Studies*:¹ but its main tendencies and argument remain significant.

Had revision been acceptable in the collecting and reprinting of these variously dated essays, that on 'The Word Phoneme' which opens the book would certainly have been omitted, as it is but a hurried sketch: and it has lately been entirely superseded by the paper of Daniel Jones already referred to, *The History and Meaning of the term Phoneme*. Yet even in their unrevised form and despite some not always happy informalities of style, the publication of these papers in a convenient volume will be widely welcomed. It fittingly marks the retirement from academic routine and from this country's first Chair of General Linguistics of one who, while making his own special general linguistics a dominating force in our largest university, has always given the study of the English language within his own discipline marked recognition.

C. L. WRENN

SHORT NOTICES

The English and Scottish Popular Ballads. Edited by FRANCIS JAMES CHILD. Five volumes in three. Vol. I, pp. xxxii + 508; Vol. II, pp. x + 516; Vol. III, pp. x + 522; Vol. IV, pp. x + 526; Vol. V, pp. x + 570. [Reprint.] New York: The Folklore Press in association with Pageant Book Company; London: Oxford University Press, 1957. £12. 12s.

Students of the ballad will welcome unreservedly the addition, by offset process, of 500 sets of 'Child' to the 1,000 issued in ten parts between 1882 and 1898. The temptation to revise and enlarge the original has properly been resisted; it was in a real sense definitive. Its editor's name has become a means of indicating both a genre of folk-poetry and (for English) the 305 extant examples with their variants. The time is scarcely ripe for bringing together systematically the hundreds of additional variants heard and reported since about 1906 in Britain and America by collectors like Cecil Sharp, Gavin Greig, P. Barry, H. H. Flanders, D. Scarborough, Alan Lomax. In the meantime the present publishers have taken account of the twentieth-century revolution in this field by preparing, under the supervision of A. L. Lloyd and Ewan MacColl, nine records containing seventy-two ballads as rendered by traditional singers, largely from their own family traditions. These include ten not printed by Child (virtually the only 'new' ballads to turn up since his day) which have some claim to be authentically popular. Child, who habitually spoke of ballad literature, printed only fifty-five tunes in an appendix. Almost 5,000 are now known; they are being published by Professor B. H. Bronson (*The Melodic Tradition of the Popular Ballads*, Princeton, 1959-).

'The sources of British ballads are dried up for ever.' Child would have rejoiced to find his lament to Grundtvig proved so wide of the mark, and there is irony in the fact that a reprint of his great collection has been made necessary by a growing interest in ballads as living forms—not the uncertain vestiges of a degenerating and moribund tradition that he and his contemporaries took them for.

The reduced page of this reprint leaves the typography of even the notes and indexes

¹ Cf., for instance, Dr. A. Cohen's dissertation *The Phonemes of English* (The Hague, 1952) and the material there cited.

sharp and comfortably legible. Prefixed to Volume I is the memoir of Child (who died in 1896) inserted by Kittredge into the final instalment when he saw it through the press in 1898. This may be supplemented usefully from S. B. Hustvedt's *Ballad Books and Ballad Men* (Cambridge, Mass., 1930) and, for William MacMath's help with the Scottish material, J. D. Reppert's article in *P.M.L.A.*, lxxi (1956), 510-20. J. C. BRYCE

The Descent of Euphuus. Three Elizabethan Romance Stories. *Euphuus, Pandosto, Piers Plainness*. By J. WINNY. Pp. xxvi+180. Cambridge: University Press, 1957. 16s. net.

One must begin a notice of this book with commendation for the enterprise of the Cambridge University Press in providing good texts, finely printed, in moderate bulk and at a possible price. The volume should be widely useful in undergraduate teaching.

As the title suggests, the book is meant to illustrate the 'growth and decline of a fashion', and 'the vicissitudes of literary fashion could have no better example than the history of Euphuism provides'; accordingly, the editor prints three texts—the narrative section of *Euphuus*, the *Anatomy of Wit*, Greene's *Pandosto* (which 'might be said to lie between the extremes of courtly and vernacular traditions and to exploit both'), and Chettle's *Piers Plainness* (to show 'how rapidly rogue literature may have encroached upon the popularity of Elizabethan romance fiction').

The short introduction pursues this line of connexion, giving first a lively and most sensitive appreciation of Euphuism as a typically Elizabethan style, then tracing its relations with literary realism in the other two works. The argument reads smoothly and works well; unfortunately (perhaps necessarily) it leaves unindicated complicating factors of some magnitude.

No courtly tradition other than that of Euphuism is mentioned, but Lyly's narrative style cannot be used to stand for the whole complicated issue of Elizabethan attempts on the high style in prose—even as that bears on the other works printed. Likewise it would be well, in connexion with *Piers Plainness*, to indicate the traditions of 'Estates Satire' and 'Complaint', described by Helen C. White and John Peter, which complicate the issues of realism. To exploit these fully would have been to enlarge the introduction beyond reasonable limits, but their existence could have been indicated in passing: a short bibliography might have helped to redress the balance.

The texts are very accurate: there is one tangle of punctuation on p. 150 which may represent editorial interference; if so, it could have gone farther. A word is added on p. 157 without necessity. The errors discovered are all of this trifling kind. I am not entirely convinced, however, of the virtues of near type-facsimile texts for the purposes this book is meant to fulfil. In particular, it seems an error to omit the 1579 additions to *Euphuus*, patently necessary to complete meanings and consonances.

The glossary likewise is too curt for the uninstructed reader. There is an all-too-common failure to gloss words which are familiar to the modern reader in slightly different senses—'comical event' (p. 121), 'consorts' (p. 128), 'tall' (p. 131), 'baylie' (p. 140), 'exercise' (p. 159), &c.—and these are the words most liable to mislead the modern reader.

G. K. HUNTER

The Marchants Avizo. By I[ohn] B[rowne,] *Marchant*, 1589. Edited by PATRICK McGRATH. Pp. xxxviii+64. Cambridge, Mass.: Baker Library, Harvard Graduate School; London: St. Catherine Press, 1957. 8s. 6d. net.

Whilst this reprint will interest primarily specialists in mercantile history, being the earliest English manual composed for the use of young factors going overseas (the examples are confined to the Portuguese and Spanish trades) to contract business on behalf of their masters, it also throws some light, as the editor remarks, on the general outlook of Elizabethan England. Thus, as well as tables of weights and measures, a form for accounting, and some sample bills, bonds, &c., there are 'Certaine godly sentences, necessary for a youth to meditate vpon', and a moral tale to end with. Students of English prose style will

be particularly interested in the eight letters to which Angel Day referred the readers of the second edition of his *The English Secretorie* (1592) as 'most fully and ampie suffizing' for instructing a factor on how to address his master. In his full introduction Mr. McGrath gives good reasons for believing that these letters are genuine ones taken from the files of the Bristol merchant Thomas Aldworth. He also satisfactorily identifies John Browne, the author.

The text is that of the hitherto unrecorded first edition (Mr. McGrath has also discovered a copy of the previously unknown second edition, 1590); and the slight changes made in the later editions are recorded in the notes. It was no doubt owing to the lack of revision, as also to the appearance of Lewis Roberts's far more comprehensive *Merchants Map of Commerce* in 1638, that no edition was printed after that of 1640. The text has been carefully edited (*fauor* on p. 25 would appear to be a misprint for *sauor*), and there are some useful notes; rather more explanation is needed of some of the commercial terms, and philologists will lament the absence of a glossary where, for example, they might find *barbage*/*barking*, *barratry* (O.E.D. gives the earliest usage in marine law as 1622), *hundage*, *searne* (i.e. *seron*), and *windage*. *Couen* (p. 51) = ?cheat, is possibly a misprint for *cousen*. But Mr. McGrath has done much to illuminate the obscure and his failures to provide enlightenment are few. J. R.

The Life and Death of Jack Straw. Prepared by KENNETH MUIR and F. P. WILSON. Pp. x+4 plates+44. Oxford: University Press for the Malone Society, 1957.

Nothing is known about the authorship or stage history of this 'interlude', which was entered in the Stationers' Register to John Danter on 23 October 1593 and printed by him at the turn of the year with a title-page dated 1593 and colophon dated 1594. It is a dull piece but a mercifully short one, and perhaps only those who are interested in its printer will be encouraged to read it more than once: for *Jack Straw* came from the same printing-house as *Titus Andronicus* (S.R., 6 February 1594) and provides a good approach to the spelling habits of Danter's two compositors.

I think it a pity that the Malone Society reprints do not do more to provide the kind of bibliographical account of the original that editors now need. The present volume follows the customary lines. The text has been set up from photostats of the British Museum copy collated with photostats of the Bute copy (the only other one known); but lists of variant, doubtful, and erroneous readings are only part of a story which users of these reprints cannot complete for themselves from the evidence before them. ALICE WALKER

Love's Labour's Lost 1598. Edited by SIR WALTER GREG. Pp. viii+76 (Shakespeare quarto facsimiles 10). Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957. 25s. net.

This volume, like the others in this most important series, has been prepared under the care of the greatest of our scholars in Shakespearian bibliography. It has been made from the very good Heber copy in the British Museum and comparison with that shows it to be an excellent reproduction. Although the original is fairly clear the book is notorious for the poor work of its compositor, and perhaps a longer list of confirmatory readings might have been given. There are twenty-four of these—checked with the Malone copy—on p. [iv] but the list could easily have been doubled. For example, the *vene we of wit* of v. i. 64, which is used as a proof that F1 was printed from the quarto, is by no means clear and neither are the words *it reioyceth* in the next line. The Griggs-Furnivall facsimile was made from the Devonshire copy and variants between that and the Heber and four other of the total of twelve known copies are listed on p. [iv]. These are few and add nothing of importance to the differences between the Capell and Devonshire copies which were given by the Cambridge editors in 1863 and 1891 and repeated, incorrectly, in the Griggs-Furnivall facsimile.

The reproduction is so good that variations in inking are more or less faithfully reproduced. The British Museum stamps of ownership on the back of the title-page and of date

of acquisition—4 Au 64—on K2^v have not been reproduced. Something apparently went a little wrong with the photography of K2^v, for the original of this is quite clean: it has the worm holes in the top right corner and the notch taken from the top left which are shown in the facsimile; but the other smudges and marks in the facsimile are not now to be seen in the original.

As with other volumes in the series the divisions of act, scene, and line (following the Globe edn. of 1891) are conveniently given in the margin of each page. The pages are, however, not numbered.

J. H. P. PAFFORD

Magic in the Web. Action and Language in *Othello*. By ROBERT B. HEILMAN. Pp. viii+298. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1956. \$5.00.

Mr. Heilman's book is an attempt to communicate what Professor Knights has designated 'a total complex emotional response', though the author disarms criticism at the outset by claiming that it is merely 'one man's reading of *Othello*'. I am forced to admit that it is not my reading, that I require a response that is at once both more simple and more complex and that I honour Mr. Heilman's intentions more highly than his performance.

The chief merit of the book is its firm and perceptive handling of Iago, especially in the two chapters which analyse 'the Iago world' in terms of 'styles in deception' ('the disturbing of appearances, the robbing of truthful associates, the confounding of light and dark, the spreading of disease in the guise of a cure') and 'styles in revelation'. The author's treatment of *Othello* is much less secure. He repudiates the notion of 'the noble Moor' and seeks to establish a 'readiness in the victim' arising from self-deception, self-dramatization, and defective sexuality. It is doubtless true that

The sweep, the color, the resonance, the spontaneity, the frequent exoticism of the images—all this magniloquence suggests largeness and freedom of spirit, and it is at first easy to forget that self-deception, limitedness of feeling, and egotism may also inhabit this verbal expansiveness.

But the difficulty lies in drawing valid distinctions between the magniloquence proper to the Elizabethan (and Aristotelian) tragic hero and that which may or may not aim at a less formal revelation. And is *Othello*'s speech more magniloquent than that of Hamlet, Lear, Macbeth, long after they have passed beyond self-deception and egotism? Since Iago hoodwinks every character in the play, including his wife, why should the Moor's inability to detect his drift be regarded as self-deception? The hero's sexuality is, I think, something which we are intended to take for granted and the charges against *Othello* could equally well apply to other major characters. Revealed sexuality is not the strong suit of Romeo or Hamlet or Macbeth or Posthumus Leonatus. A lot seems to depend on how many children Desdemona would have had if *Othello* had been in Macbeth's position. And why, incidentally, do those critics who are loud in their denunciation of Bradley's meditations on pre-beginnings overlook the ending of *Othello* and postulate the Moor's damnation?

Mr. Heilman's book raises other doubts. It may be argued that 'one man's reading', on the evidence of his disproportionate and inconvenient notes, is in fact a porridge of good, bad, and middling opinion, that the premises are false and the evidence manipulated, and that he often uses a most vile critical jargon. Yet, for all its faults, *Magic in the Web* is informed, thoughtful and, at heart, sensible. Mr. Heilman's speculations are, at any rate, preferable to the arid practicalities of Granville Barker's weaker successors.

J. M. NOSWORTHY

William Blackstone and the Reform of the Oxford University Press in the Eighteenth Century. By I. G. PHILIP. Pp. vi+130 (Oxford Bibliographical Society Publications 7). Oxford: University Press for the Society, 1957.

In 1956 Mr. I. G. Philip was awarded the Gordon Duff Prize for an essay which threw new light on Blackstone's 'single-handed campaign for the reorganization of the Press' at

Oxford, of which he was a Delegate from 1755 to 1766. The essay has now been printed by the Oxford Bibliographical Society, with the documents on which it was based. Apart from the open 'Letter to the Rev. Dr. Randolph, Vice-Chancellor of the University of Oxford' which Blackstone published in 1757, in which he referred to the Press, in words often quoted, as 'languishing in a lazy obscurity', these documents are all now printed for the first time, and Mr. Philip has performed a most valuable service in unearthing them from the archives of the Clarendon Press, and from the Bodleian. As he says in his essay, 'it has not been generally acknowledged that it was Blackstone himself who reformed the whole organization of the Printing-House and put it "under better regulations", having first studied and mastered the many intricate and technical problems which the work of the Press involved'.

The story is of the greatest interest, not only for the history of the University Press, but that of printing in the eighteenth century in general. Blackstone, with the 'almost excessive love of order and regularity' ascribed to him by the *D.N.B.*, equipped himself for his duties as a Delegate by making a detailed study of the rates of printing costs and the methods of fixing them, both in Oxford and in London, and his memorandum on the subject, with the information supplied to him by Daniel Prince of Oxford and Samuel Richardson of London, are documents of the first importance.

Blackstone was a formidable and persistent critic, and, what was worse, a constructive one, and the documents are not without human interest. The Vice-Chancellor and some of the Delegates, and of course the 'nest of imposing mechanics' in the Clarendon Building, tried hard to maintain the existing order, but Blackstone's arguments and energy were irresistible and ten years later Dr. Johnson was able to tell George III when he asked him 'what they were doing at Oxford', that 'he could not much commend their diligence, but that in some respects they were mended, for they had put their press under better regulations'.

A. L. P. NORRINGTON

Wartime English. Materials for a Linguistic History of World War II.

By R. W. ZANDVOORT and Assistants. Pp. x+254 (Groningen Studies in English 6). Groningen: Wolters, 1957. Fl. 7.90.

Despite some differences of aim, this is a sister work to the transatlantic *Language of World War II*, compiled by A. Marjorie Taylor (1944; revised and enlarged edition 1948). It takes the form of a glossary, with illustrative quotations from English books and newspapers issued between 1938 (the year of Munich) and 1948 (the Berlin air lift), preceded by a short Preface in which Professor Zandvoort says that 'attention [has been] concentrated on words commonly used or known by the majority of *adult civilians* [my italics] in England'. It follows that many words of a non-military character (*Bevin Boy*, *Brains Trust*, *point(s) system*, *purchase tax*, *spiv*, &c.) are included with the terms of the fighting services (*commando*, *N.A.A.F.I.*, *paratroop*, *partisan*, *sortie*, &c.), and that words more or less restricted to the services are excluded (e.g. *casa*, *flash-spotting*, *kaput*, *sound-ranging*, *Spandau*, from the land war in Italy). Most of the words treated were neologisms of the period, but the editor has also admitted a few older words and phrases (such as *Anzac*, *air-minded*, and *ex-service man*) 'whose renewed proliferation entitled them to a place in this collection' (p. vii). Evidently no systematic attempt was made to find quotations from the year in which a given term entered the language: thus *airgraph* is illustrated by quotations of 1943 and 1944, but the service was inaugurated in 1941. Similarly there are only 1945 and later quotations for *Ack-ack*. Omissions include *Maginot*/Siegfried Line, *Schnorkel*, *spam*, *swastika*, and *Tommy gun*. Under *boffin* the first quotation does not seem to accord with the definition. None the less *Wartime English* is a well-conceived book, which records in a disciplined and economical form a large number of the words and phrases which were in constant use in the decade 1938-48.

R. W. BURCHFIELD

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE

ANGLIA

Band 76, Heft 4, 1958

- Die weiblichen Genusuffixe im Altenglischen (B. von Lindheim), 479-504.
The Vocabulary of Ralph Lever's *Arte of Reason* (J. L. Rosier), 505-9.
Übermensch und Treue [Chapman] (R. Gerber), 510-35.
John Donne and William Cowper (P. Legouis), 536-8.

ANNALI (ISTITUTO UNIVERSITARIO ORIENTALE)

Sezione Germanica, Vol. 1, 1958

- I problemi esterni del *Heland* (S. Lupi), 115-37.
Il valorefonetico di *h e r* nei dialetti antico-germanici (G. Manganello), 139-51.
Evil and the American Short Story (R. L. Gale), 183-202.
Omaggio a Ezra Pound (E. Schulte), 203-37.
Il teatro di T. S. Eliot (E. Bassi), 239-68.

BRNO STUDIES IN ENGLISH

Vol. 1, 1959

- Two chapters on Written English (J. Vachek), 7-38.
Communicative Function of the Verb in English, German, and Czech (J. Fírbas), 39-68.
Reflection of Social Reality in Keats's Poems and Letters (K. Štěpánek), 69-101.
The 'Newgate School' of Romance in English Literature of the Eighteen-Thirties (L. Pantůčková), 103-17.
Revolt of the Workers in the Novels of Gissing, James, and Conrad (J. Kocmanová), 119-43.

BULLETIN OF THE JOHN RYLANDS LIBRARY

Vol. xli, No. 2, March 1959

- Religious Issues in Late Nineteenth-Century American Novels (W. E. Davies), 328-59.
A Missing Leaf from Swift's 'Holyhead Journal' (G. P. Mayhew), 388-413.
A Lord Mayor's Show by John Taylor, the Water Poet (S. Williams), 501-31.

COMPARATIVE LITERATURE

Vol. x, No. 4, Fall 1958

- The Madness of Hercules and the Elizabethans (R. Soellner), 309-24.
The Modern Hero: Phoenix or Ashes? (E. Kern), 325-34.
The 'Truth' in John Ford's *The Broken Heart* (G. M. Carsaniga), 344-8.

Vols. i-x: Cumulative Index 1949-58

CRITICAL QUARTERLY

Vol. i, No. 1, Spring 1959

- Hardy's *Under the Greenwood Tree* (J. F. Danby), 5-13.
Philip Larkin (C. B. Cox), 14-17.
Dylan Thomas's Play for Voices (R. Williams), 18-26.
Hamlet Criticism (G. K. Hunter), 27-32.
The English Island Myth (R. Gerber), 36-43.
Blake's *The Little Black Boy* (A. E. Dyson), 44-47.
Chesterton and/or Belloc (B. Bergonzi), 64-71.

DURHAM UNIVERSITY JOURNAL

Vol. xx, N.S. No. 2, March 1959

- Wordsworth and 'the ballast of familiar life' (H. Gifford), 65-70.

ENGLISH

Vol. xii, No. 70, Spring 1959

- Language in the Historical Novel (G. Trease), 126-9.
The Deserted Village and Sir Robert Walpole (K. J. Fielding), 130-2.
Comic Viewpoints in *Sketches by Boz* (C. B. Cox), 132-5.

ENGLISH STUDIES

Vol. xl, No. 2, April 1959

- Marvell's *The Garden*: A Hermetic Poem (M-S. Rostvig), 65-76.
Ulysses and Tennyson's Sea-Quest (G. Roppen), 77-90.
Intellectual Quest of the Victorian Poets (K. Smidt), 90-102.
Linguistic Status of Irregular Verbal Forms in English (T. Heltveit), 102-8.
Notes on Names [Stobetle, Belnacre, Spolde, Nubbe] (B. Sundby), 109-12.
Language of Caxton's *Malory* and of the Winchester MS (A. O. Sandved), 113-14.

ESSAYS IN CRITICISM

Vol. ix, No. 2, April 1959

- Timon of Athens* (A. Gomme), 107-25.
The Ocean-Desert: The Ancient Mariner and The Waste Land (F. Marsh), 126-33.
The Autobiographical Novel and the Autobiography (R. Pascal), 134-50.
Social Security in Literary Criticism (M. J. Collie), 151-8.
Critical Forum: Submerged Metaphor in Pope, Mode of the Novel, 197-209.

ÉTUDES ANGLAISES

XII^e Année, No. 1, janvier-mars 1959

- Exégètes et Interprètes de James Joyce (J. Jacquot), 30-46.

334 SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE

La Recherche des Sources de la *Tragédie du Vengeur*, (P. Legouis), 47-55.

HUNTINGTON LIBRARY QUARTERLY

Vol. xxii, No. 2, February 1959

The First English Petrarchans (P. Thomson), 85-105.
John Astley, 'Our English Xenophon' (H. S. Wilson), 107-18.
Ascham's *Toxophilus* in Heroic Verse (L. V. Ryan), 119-24.
The Making of *The Deserted Village* (E. Miner), 125-41.

LENGUAS VIVAS

Año II, No. 3, mayo 1958

Milton, a Classic (E. Charola), 13-24.
Graham Greene and the Theologians (J. S. Gaynor), 24-26.

MEDIUM ÆVUM

Vol. xxvii, No. 3, 1958

Doctrinal Influences on *The Dream of the Rood* (R. Woolf), 137-53.
The Character of Gauvain in the Thirteenth-century Prose Romances (F. Bogdanow), 154-61.
Herodias in the Auchinleck *Sir Orfeo* (M. J. Donovan), 162-5.
Lydgate's Changes in the *Temple of Glas* (J. N. Smith), 166-72.
Viper into Weasel [Melibee 1.2515] (G. E. Brereton), 173-4.
A Common Source for *Erec* and *Gereint* (R. S. Loomis), 175-8.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

Vol. lxxiv, No. 2, February 1959

Calvin, Spencer, and the Major Sacraments (W. H. Marshall), 97-101.
Jonson on the Christ's College Dons (J. I. Cope), 101-2.
The Fortunate Fall in *Paradise Lost* (W. G. Madsen), 103-5.
Perth: An Organic Digression in *Moby Dick* (J. Satterfield), 106-7.
Animal Imagery in *The Red Badge of Courage* (M. and E. Marcus), 108-11.
A Symphysis of Antipaties in *The Dead* (P. Damon), 111-14.
Dostoevsky and *Sanctuary* (E. Wasiolek), 114-17.
Dylan Thomas' First Published Poem (R. N. Maud), 117-18.

Vol. lxxiv, No. 3, March 1959

A Lost Chaucerian Stanza? (J. B. Severs), 193-8.
The M. E. Carol Corpus: Some Additions (R. H. Robbins), 198-208.
Pope's 'Iv'ry Gate' [Dunciad, III. 340] (D. P. Deneau), 208-11.
Johnson Echoes Dryden (G. J. Kolb), 212-13.

Narrative Technique in *Rappaccini's Daughter* (B. McCabe), 213-17.

Melville Roasts Thoreau's Cock (W. B. Stein), 218-19.
Peine Forte et Dure and Hopkins' 'Margaret Clitheroe' (R. J. Schoeck), 220-4.
A Probable Source for a James *Nouvelle* (J. H. Frantz), 225-6.
Joyce's Use of Memory in *A Mother* (M. J. O'Neill), 226-30.
Cummings and Catullus (S. Baker), 231-4.

MODERN LANGUAGE QUARTERLY

Vol. xix, No. 4, December 1958

More's 'Apologia Pro Utopia Sua' (E. Surtz, S.J.), 319-24.
An Unrecognised Poem by Marston? (G. Cross), 325-30.
The Bedeviling of Young Goodman Brown (T. F. Walsh, Jr.), 331-6.
James Joyce and Thomas Hardy (H. M. Block), 337-42.
Iapponia, Lapland, and Laputa (P. O. Clark), 343-51.

MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW

Vol. liv, No. 2, April 1959

The Fitzwilliam MS of Swinburne's *Atalanta*, Verses 1038-1204 (P. F. Baum), 161-78.
An Early Rudimentary Carol (R. H. Robbins), 221-2.
Dunbar's 'Quod Cinis Es' (J. Wordsworth, I. Hyde), 223.
Shakespeare's Use of Pliny Reconsidered (K. Muir), 224-5.
Dryden and Rupert Brooke (J. R. Moore), 226.

MODERN PHILOLOGY

Vol. lvi, No. 3, February 1959

Addison at Work on the *Spectator* (R. D. Chambers), 145-53.
The Function of Dance in the Melodramas of Pixérécourt (O. G. Brockett), 154-61.
Browning's Poetic Laboratory; The Uses of *Sordello* (P. Honan), 162-6.
Twain's Method and Theory of Composition (S. J. Krause), 167-77.
Young Galsworthy: The Forging of a Satirist (D. B. Pallette), 178-86.
The Supplement to the CBEL [review article] (G. J. Kolb), 197-203.

NEOPHILOLOGUS

43ste Jaarg., Afl. 2, April 1959

The Affricates of the High German Consonant Shift (L. F. Brosnahan), 113-23.

- accimi's
(W. B.)
Hopkins' (choeck),
Nouvelle
Mother
Baker),
a Sua'
Marston?
oodman
(H. M.)
(P. O.)
burne's
Baum),
(R. H.)
Words-
nsidered
Moore),
Spectator
e Melo-
rockett),
y; The
2-6.
Compo-
ing of a
[review
German
snahan),
- An Approach to *The Dream of the Rood* (J. A. Burrow), 123-33.
Milton at Florence (S. B. Liljegren), 133-7.
A Note on the Source of the Icelandic Translation of the Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle (Foote), 137-42.

NEUPHILOLOGISCHE MITTEILUNGEN

- Vol. ix, Nr. 1, April 1959
The Presentation of Finnish Runos (T. J. Mustanoja), 1-11.
Two Minor French Lyric Forms in English (P. J. Frankis), 66-71.
Romantic Imagery in *The Waves* (I. Rantavaara), 72-89.

NOTES AND QUERIES

- Vol. vi, N.S. No. 2, February 1959
Longfellow's Uncompleted Review of *Like Unto Like*, 48-49.
James Joyce and Dr. Kuno Meyer, 49-50.
Oscar Wilde's *Salome*, 56-57.
W. H. Hudson's First Days in England, 57-58.
Marvell and Nature, 58-61.
Blurt, Master Constable, 61-65.
A Clough Epitaph, 65-66.
An Ur-Faustus?, 66-68.
Crane's *The Red Badge of Courage*, 68-69.
'Suffocating streams' [*Othello*, III. iii. 395], 69-71.
The Marlowe Canon, 71-74.
Jerdan on Coleridge, 74-76.
Elizabethan and Jacobean Printers' Use of the Tilde, 76-77.
Byron in *The Gentleman's Magazine*, 77.
An Incident from Carlyle in Tennyson's *Maud*, 77-78.
Shamela and Amelia: An Unnoted Parallel, 78.

- Vol. vi, N.S. No. 3, March 1959
Wordsworth and Pickersgill, 86-87.
Byron at Chillon, 87.
Hamlet and Heyst Again, 87-88.
George Granville and the 'Remaines' of Aphra Behn, 88-92.
More Ancient 'Agelasti', 92.
'A Table of Green Fields', 92-94.
Was Spencer in Ireland in Early November, 1579?, 99-101.
Notes on Marston's Vocabulary (XVI), 101-2.
The Plays of Charles Rogers, 102-3.
'Barlay'—*Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*, 104.
A John Payne Collier Unfabricated 'Fabrication', 104-6.
The Two-Wilsons Controversy, 106-9.
Hopkins, Hall Caine, and Rossetti, 109-10.

- Conrad's *Heart of Darkness*, 110-11.
The Word 'Alfredian', 111-12.
'Will, My Lord of Leicester's Jestng Player', 112.
Smollett's Use of 'Tsonnonthouan', 112-13.
Hardy's *Our Exploits at West Foley*: A Correction, 113.

Vol. vi, N.S. No. 4, April 1959

- Scott and the Pilgrim Penman, 127-9.
William Rowley and *The Golden Legend*, 129-30.
Donne: An Early Nineteenth-Century Estimate, 131-2.
Three Poems by Giles Fletcher, The Elder, in *Poemata Varii Argumenti* (1678), 132-4.
Cummings and Campion, 134-6.
The Vocabulary of John Marston (XVII), 137-9.
The Early History of Mercers' School, 139-40.
The Mystery of *The Cruell Warre*, 140-2.
Coleridge, Milton, and Lost Paradise, 143-4.
Tennyson's *To Virgil*, 147-8.
Thorn-Drury's Marginalia on Sir John Suckling, 148-50.
The Defence of Conny catching, 150-3.
Trollope's Copy of the 1647 Beaumont and Fletcher Folio, 153-5.

Vol. vi, N.S. No. 5, May 1959

- 'Brinkmanship', 162-3.
The Arnolds and Particular Truth, 163-4.
Cibber's *The Rival Queens*, 164-8.
The Duchess of Malfi, 174-5.
Frederic Harrison and Bergson, 175-8.
The MS of Ralph Knevet's *Gallery to the Temple*, 183-5.
Rasselas and his Ancestors, 185-8.
'Deviceless', 188.
A Note on Prufrock, 188-9.
A New Biographical Criticism of Wyatt, 189.
Horestes' Revenge, 190.
The Friar's Tale, I. 1314, 190-2.
Joseph Glanvill, Divine and Scientist, 193-80, 192.
'Tumble-up', 193.
'Chipping Norton a Mile from Chapel of the Heath', 193.
Pope's Imitations of Fanshawe, 193-4.

PHILOLOGICAL QUARTERLY

Vol. xxxvii, No. 4, October, 1958

- Edmund Curll, Mrs. James Barker, and the English Novel (W. H. McBurney), 385-99.
Sinclair Lewis's Unwritten Novel (S. Grebstein), 400-9.

336 SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE

John Cleveland and the Satiric Couplet in the Restoration (J. L. Kimmey), 410-23.

Rochester's 'Scepter' Lampoon on Charles II (D. M. Vieth), 424-32.

Defoe's Pacifator Reconsidered (A. Rosenberg), 433-9.

Steele and the Fall of Harley in 1714 (C. Winton), 440-7.

Thomson and the Licensers of the Stage (A. D. McKillop), 448-53.

Wordsworth's 'A POET!—He hath put his heart to school' (P. Fussell, Jr.), 454-64.

Ruskin's Defense of Turner (V. A. Burd), 465-83.

The Arts of Discourse in England, 1500-1700 (V. Harris), 484-94.

Alexander's Feast: A Possible Chronology of Development (J. R. Moore), 495-8.

Ovid's Exile and Milton's Rustication (R. W. Condee), 498-502.

Milton, Valvasone, and the Schoolmen (J. M. Steadman), 502-4.

Shakespeare's Pronunciation of Stephano [M. V. v. i. 28, 51] (J. S. Kenyon), 504-6.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY LIBRARY CHRONICLE

Vol. xx, No. 2, Winter 1959

Arthur Symonds' Renderings of Mallarmé (R. A. Lhombreaud), 89-102.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION

Vol. lxxiv, No. 1, March 1959

The *Diana* of Montemayor: Tradition and Innovation (J. B. Avallé-Arce), 1-6.

Milton and the Protestant Theory of the Atonement (C. A. Patrides), 7-13.

Dryden and the Imagination: The First Phase (J. M. Aden), 28-40.

Science in Biblical Paraphrases in Eighteenth-Century England (W. Powell Jones), 41-51.

Akenside's Revision of *The Pleasures of the Imagination* (J. Hart), 67-74.

Some Notes on Johnson and the *Gentleman's Magazine* (D. J. Greene), 75-84.

Dramatic Technique in the *Lyrical Ballads* (S. M. Parrish), 85-97.

Alfred de Vigny and William Charles Macready (J. F. Marshall), 98-101.

The Confidence-Man: His Guises (J. E. Miller, Jr.), 102-11.

Point of View in *The Turn of the Screw* (A. E. Jones), 112-22.

Swinburne's *Lost Love* (C. Y. Lang), 123-30.

American Notices of Lamb in 1828 (S. A. Larrabee), 157.

Browning's *Shrewd Duke* (L. Perrine), 157-9.

RIVISTA DI LETTERATURA MODERNA E COMPARATE

Anno 11, Nos. 3-4, Dicembre 1958

Byron Traducteur, et les influences italiennes (J. de Palacio), 209-30.

SEWANEE REVIEW

Vol. lxii, No. 2, Spring 1959

A Literary Correspondence [on Joyce and Lawrence] (A. Dahiberg and Sir Herbert Read), 177-203.

Prince Hal and the Ephesians (J. A. Bryant, Jr.), 204-19.

Twelfth Night and the Morality of Indulgence (J. Hollander), 220-38.

THEATRE RESEARCH

Vol. i, No. 1, March 1958

The Theatre of the American Frontier: A Bibliographical Essay (W. G. B. Carson), 14-23.

English Private Theatres Abroad [illustrated] (S. Rosenfeld), 24-29.

A Terminology for Sixteenth-century Stage Forms (A. M. Nagler), 30-33.

Important Articles in the *Times Literary Supplement*, [1902-56] (O. E. B. Youngs), 42-48.

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO QUARTERLY

Vol. xxviii, No. 3, April 1959

Tragic Effect in *Samson Agonista* (A. S. P. Woodhouse), 205-22.

Browning's 'The Statue and the Bust' (W. O. Raymond), 233-49.

Hawthorne's *Mythology*: A Mirror for Puritans (H. McPherson), 267-78.

The Limitations of George Orwell (D. J. Dooley), 291-300.

Biography: Art or Craft? [review article] (J. L. Clifford), 301-9.

VICTORIAN STUDIES

Vol. ii, No. 3, March 1959

Dickens and the Jews (H. Stone), 223-53.

Matthew Arnold's Reading-lists in Three Early Diaries (K. Allott), 254-66.

Lang),

n 1828

errine),

ERNE I

fluences

n Joyce
and Sir

(J. A.

ality of
38.

Frontier:

G. B.

d [illus-

-century

2-33.

Literary

(Youngs),

LY

Agonistes

the Bust'

irror for

78.

Orwell

w article]

, 223-53.

in Three

66.